FINAL REPORT
COMMUNITY TASK FORCE ON NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES

(As Amended and Adopted by City Council on July 8 and 9, 1982)

362.971
3541
COM

PROPERTY OF BOROUGH OF SCARBOROUGH

RESOURCE CENTRE

July 12, 1982.

In the summer of 1981, Toronto City Council established the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood, Social and Recreational Services. The twelve-member Task Force, composed of representatives of Council, civic departments, local school boards and community agencies, was requested by Council to undertake a review of the social and recreational needs of City residents and the services now being offered.

The first objective of the Task Force was to set out for Council's consideration those services and programs it believed should be directly provided by the City and those for which it was more appropriate for delivery by community agencies. In the latter instance, the ways in which the City should financially or otherwise assist such local efforts were to be carefully reviewed. Following a determination of appropriate roles of the City and community agencies in the provision of services, the Task Force undertook to develop the ways in which this system of public and voluntary activity could be effectively co-ordinated. To this end recommendations were developed with respect to the provision of information, planning, management of resources, accountability, and funding.

The Task Force established a review process that relied heavily upon consultation with local residents, community agencies and civic departments. The final report is a reflection of the interest and co-operation generated by this process.

The report appears in the form it was presented to Council. The Council amendments, which appear on page 56, have not significantly altered the recommendations of the Task Force. This report, with amendments, was adopted by Council on July 8, 1982.

On behalf of the Task Force members, I want to express our appreciation to those who gave so willingly of their time. In our view, implementation of the recommendations will benefit from a heightened sense of interest and spirit of co-operation that has been established.

Paul Zarnke,
Chairman,
Community Task Force on Neighbourhood
Social and Recreational Services.

COMPOSITION OF THE TASK FORCE

Members:

Chris Baldwin	Association of Community Centres
Rose Burgess	Association of Community Centres
Beverley Hodgson	Citizen Advisory Councils, City Recreation Centres
Ron Kanter	Alderman - Ward 5
Chris Korwin-Kuczynski	Alderman - Ward 2
Mitchell Kosny	Toronto Association of Neighbourhood Services
Andy Paton	Alderman - Ward 10
John Piper	Toronto Board of Education
Herb Pirk	Department of Parks and Recreation
David Reville	Alderman - Ward 7
Gerry Stokes	Metropolitan Separate School Board
Paul Zarnke (Chairman)	Toronto Association of Neighbourhood Services
David Millar	Task Force Co-ordinator

TABLE OF CONTENTS

OVERVIEW 3

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS 5

I. INTRODUCTION 11

II. ORGANIZATION OF REPORT 11

III. CONTEXT OF CITY POLICY 11

IV. ROLES OF THE CITY 13

A. Issues
B. Guiding Principles
C. Recommendations

V. CITY FUNDING POLICY 17

A. Issues
B. Recommendations

VI. LONG-TERM PLANNING 20

A. Issues
B. Guiding Principles
C. Recommendations

VII. PROGRAM PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION 22

A. Issues
B. Guiding Principles
C. Recommendations

VIII. MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY 23

A. Issues
B. Guiding Principles
C. Recommendations

IX. PROVISION OF INFORMATION 25

A. Issues
B. Recommendations

X. IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND DEVELOPMENT 26

A. Issues
B. Recommendations

XI. COST IMPLICATIONS 28

APPENDICES

A. Mandate of the Task Force 32

B. Policy on Priorities for Use of City-operated Recreation Centres 33

C. Policy Guidelines: Recreation Grants Administered by the Department of Parks and Recreation 33

D. Policies and Procedures for City of Toronto Recreational and General Grants 36
E. Community Centre Policy Guidelines 41
F. Procedures for Future Development of City Funded Recreation and Community Centres .. 47
G. Mandate of Implementation Task Force and Job Descriptions of Contract Staff 50
H. Background Paper (copies available on request from the Task Force) 52

OVERVIEW

During the past eleven months, the Task Force has undertaken an extensive review of the variety of the community and recreation facilities and programs currently available to City residents. In addition to the collection and review of written and statistical information, the Task Force sponsored numerous consultation opportunities. These included meetings with civic departments, individual agencies and umbrella associations. In addition eight public meetings were held and attended by some 900 people. Throughout the eleven months the Task Force received tremendous co-operation and assistance and it recognized a keen interest among providers and users of services in making constructive suggestions for the improvement of existing programs.

The Task Force is of the opinion that there are numerous strengths to be observed in the variety and quality of programs being offered and the multitude of roles and arrangements the City has adopted to deliver and support such programs. The major strengths are:

- the diversity of organizations, large and small, public and voluntary, now providing programs;
- the tens of thousands of volunteer hours contributed to the provision of service;
- the wealth of expertise and dedication apparent in the provision of quality programs that exist within the current spectrum of organizations;
- the City's direct provision of a range of recreation facilities and programs without charge to City residents; and
- the City's basic framework of funding approaches that has the potential for developing the type of partnerships between the City and the voluntary sector necessary in a city with such diverse needs.

The challenge facing the City is how to build upon these strengths and more effectively utilize the potential that exists.

At the same time, there are a number of issues and problems that constrain this potential. The most striking are:

- the lack of accessible information for the average resident on programs being offered;
- the lack of a clear statement of overall City policy on recreation and community services that would tie these components of the "system" together into a series of real partnerships;
- the lack of organizational relationships, at both the policy and operational levels, between the principal actors. This includes the lack of co-ordination among civic departments and between these departments ar d community agencies;
- the lack of information to properly engage in long-term facility and program planning and the lack of clearly designated responsibilities for such planning;
- the perception by the voluntary sector that the City does not see their services as important or complementary alternatives to the public delivery of programs;
- the perceived tendency of the City to establish new facilities, or support new organizations without sufficient examination or consultation on the potential to more fully utilize existing resources and organizations; and
- the need to make a number of specific improvements in the utilization of existing facilities and programs, and to make them more responsive to local needs, thus improving the effective management of and accountability for existing resources.

These problems are not insoluble nor do they cast doubt on the basic strengths of the programs being offered. They are, however, real constraints on the potential for providing high quality, responsive and cost effective services to City residents.

While the Task Force has considered a very broad range of issues and is making what might appear to be an extensive number of proposals, the recommendations are designed to achieve a limited but crucial set of goals. It is hoped that the statement of goals that follows will provide both a framework for understanding the purpose of the specific recommendations and will give direction to the City's future support for this area of service.

Major Goals

1. To increase public knowledge and utilization of the existing capacity of recreation and community service facilities and programs.

2. To promote greater responsiveness of programs to the unique needs of the neighbourhoods in which facilities are located.

3. To establish more adequate procedures for determining the appropriateness of proposals for new facility development.

4. To establish a City funding policy that permits Council to:

   (a) choose the most beneficial and cost effective ways of meeting identified needs;

   (b) maximize the use of public and community resources through its support of the voluntary sector;

   (c) encourage an appropriate diversity of programs; and

   (d) achieve the greatest level and quality of programs possible, given finite City financial resources.

5. To establish a policy framework and time-limited Implementation Task Force to facilitate greater co-ordination of planning and program delivery at both the city-wide and neighbourhood levels and to monitor and assist in the implementation of the recommendations adopted by Council.

6. To ensure that other funding bodies assume responsibility for adequately supporting City-based programs meeting eligibility criteria for such financial assistance.

7. To facilitate the enhancement of management, program development and program delivery capabilities of City-operated and funded facilities and programs.

8. To establish clear lines of accountability for City-operated and funded programs both to Council and to the community served.

SUMMARY OF RECOMMENDATIONS

CITY ROLES

RECREATION

1. WHEREAS RECREATION INCLUDES ALL OF THOSE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH AN INDIVIDUAL CHOOSES TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS/HER LEISURE TIME AND IS NOT CONFINED SOLELY TO SPORTS AND PHYSICAL RECREATION PROGRAMS BUT INCLUDES ARTISTIC, CREATIVE, CULTURAL, SOCIAL, INTELLECTUAL, EDUCATIONAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD BETTERMENT ACTIVITIES.

   AND WHEREAS RECREATION IS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN NEED FOR CITIZENS OF ALL AGES AND INTERESTS AND FOR BOTH SEXES AND IS ESSENTIAL TO THEIR PSYCHOLOGICAL, SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL WELL-BEING.

   AND WHEREAS CITY COUNCIL RECOGNIZES THAT RECREATION IS A SOCIAL SERVICE IN THE SAME WAY THAT HEALTH AND EDUCATION ARE CONSIDERED AS SOCIAL SERVICES, THE PURPOSES OF WHICH ARE TO: (a) ASSIST INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT; (b) IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE; AND (c) ENHANCE SOCIAL FUNCTIONING.

   THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY SHALL DIRECTLY PROVIDE AND MANAGE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION A RANGE OF BASIC RECREATION FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS FREE OF CHARGE TO CITY RESIDENTS, CONTINUE TO UTILIZE SHARED-USE AGREEMENTS UNDER LOCAL BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND FINANCIALLY ASSIST OR OTHERWISE SUPPORT THE PROVISION OF RECREATION PROGRAMS OFFERED BY VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS, AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY CENTRES SO AS TO ENSURE THAT ALL CITIZENS HAVE MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY FOR THE ENJOYABLE, SATISFYING AND CREATIVE USE OF LEISURE TIME.

COMMUNITY SERVICES

2. WHEREAS COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIST OF A BROAD RANGE OF PROGRAMS TO HELP INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES TO GAIN ACCESS TO BASIC RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONS OF OUR SOCIETY, BRING PEOPLE TOGETHER FOR MUTUAL SUPPORT, PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION, FURTHER INTER-CULTURAL RELATIONS AND PROMOTE THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF NEIGHBOURHOODS, ALL OF WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE QUALITY OF CITY LIFE.

   AND WHEREAS COUNCIL HAS DEMONSTRATED A COMMITMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF MULTI-PURPOSE NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES/COMMUNITY CENTRES BY THE PROVISION OF CORE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING.

   AND WHEREAS COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED FOR MANY YEARS GENERAL GRANTS TO A VARIETY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENCIES.

   AND WHEREAS COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED OTHER MEANS OF SUPPORT SUCH AS USE OF CITY-OWNED BUILDINGS AND SHARING OF MAINTENANCE COSTS.

   THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY SHALL FACILITATE AND SUPPORT THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES TO AS WIDE A RANGE OF TORONTO RESIDENTS AS POSSIBLE AND IT SHALL UNDERTAKE TO SUPPORT SUCH SERVICES WHERE NEED HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED THROUGH SUCH MEANS AS:

   a. THE USE OF SPACE IN CITY-OWNED BUILDINGS.

   b. THE PROMOTION OF SHARING OF NON-FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND EXPERTISE AMONG AGENCIES, E.G., JOINTLY SPONSORED RESEARCH PROJECTS, SHARING OF EQUIPMENT FOR SPECIAL EVENTS, ACCESS TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS, ETC.

c. THE PROVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO LOCAL AGENCIES.

d. THE ADVOCACY OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENTAL FUNDING BODIES.

e. THE PROVISION OF CORE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING OF MULTI-PURPOSE COMMUNITY CENTRES ESTABLISHED BY CITY BY-LAW AND MANAGED BY LOCAL BOARDS OF MANAGEMENT.

f. THE SUPPORT AND/OR UNDERTAKING OF NEEDS AND RESOURCES STUDIES AT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD LEVEL.

g. THE PROVISION OF DIRECT FINANCIAL SUPPORT THROUGH GENERAL GRANTS WHERE COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS HAVE BEEN CLEARLY IDENTIFIED AND OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPORT ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

h. THE AMENDMENT OF THE CURRENT PRIORITIES FOR THE USE OF CITY-OPERATED RECREATION FACILITIES ACCORDING TO APPENDIX "B" SO AS TO PERMIT THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY EXTERNAL ORGANIZATIONS AT THESE LOCATIONS.

i. THE PROVISION OF OTHER FORMS OF SUPPORT AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY COUNCIL.

CITY FUNDING POLICY

1. THE CITY PROVIDE GRANTS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION TO VOLUNTARY AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES FOR THE PROVISION OF DESIGNATED RECREATION PROGRAMS ACCORDING TO THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX "C".

2. FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1983, ON-GOING RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS PROVIDED BY COMMUNITY AGENCIES WHICH HAD BEEN SUPPORTED BY RECREATIONAL GRANTS FROM THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD IN EXCESS OF $10,000 IN 1982 SHALL BE FINANCED THROUGH DEPARTMENTAL GRANTS, AND THE EVALUATION AND REPORTING PROCESS WILL COMMENCE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984.

3. THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SPECIFIC RECREATIONAL GRANTS UNDER THE CURRENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AS REVISED AND CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "D" WHERE THE AMOUNT GRANTED IS LESS THAN $10,000 AND TO RECOMMEND WHERE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE FUNDED THROUGH DEPARTMENTAL GRANTS.

4. THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE REQUESTS OF THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD INCLUDE:

   a. AN AMOUNT TO ADJUST THE BASE BUDGETS OF CURRENTLY FUNDED RECREATION PROGRAMS IN ORDER TO MATCH THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT WITH DEMONSTRATED FINANCIAL NEED AND THAT AT LEAST $35,000 BE INCLUDED FOR THIS PURPOSE

   b. AN INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT TO THE 1982 BUDGET

   c. AN AMOUNT TO PERMIT THE FUNDING OF NEW PROGRAMS

   AND THESE AMOUNTS BE DEVELOPED BY THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD IN CONSULTATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE.

5. THE CITY SHOULD CONTINUE TO EXPECT THAT OTHER FUNDING BODIES ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADEQUATE FUNDING OF SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR WHICH THEY HAVE HAD AN HISTORIC INVOLVEMENT OR PROVISIONS FOR THE SUPPORT OF SUCH PROGRAMS.

6. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE, THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES AND THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD BE REQUESTED TO INITIATE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE METROPOLITAN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AND ANY OTHER FUNDING BODIES DEEMED APPROPRIATE TO DETERMINE MORE APPROPRIATE FUNDING RESPONSIBILITIES PARTICULARLY WITH RESPECT TO THE CITY'S PROVISION OF GENERAL GRANTS FOR SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS AND PREPARE A PROGRESS REPORT FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION BY DECEMBER 1, 1982.

7. THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE IN CONSULTATION WITH COMMUNITY AGENCIES PREPARE APPROPRIATE REVISIONS TO THE CURRENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CITY GRANTS IN LIGHT OF THE DISCUSSIONS REFERRED TO IN RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.

8. ANY PROPOSED CHANGES TO FUNDING CRITERIA OF THE CITY AND OTHER FUNDING BODIES BE SUBJECT TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND THE ADEQUATE FUNDING OF THOSE PROGRAMS AFFECTED.

9. THE PROPOSED COMMUNITY CENTRE POLICY GUIDELINES CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "E" BE ADOPTED.

10. THE AMOUNT PROVIDED IN THE 1983 BUDGET FOR THE FUNDING OF COMMUNITY CENTRES INCLUDE THE $50,247 REQUIRED TO AUGMENT EXISTING STAFF LEVELS AS NOTED IN SECTION 3 OF SECTION XI OF THIS REPORT AND THE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS OF THIS AMOUNT BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE PHASE OF THE BUDGET.

LONG-TERM PLANNING

1. THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE DATA BASE ON FACILITIES, PROGRAMS AND NEEDS WHICH WILL INCLUDE:

TASK	RESPONSIBILITY
a) An Inventory of Recreational Facilities.	Parks & Recreation and Planning & Development.
b) Comprehensive Community Profiles For the Neighbourhoods Served by Current Recreational and Community Service Facilities.	Planning & Development.
c) Attendance and Participation Rates for Existing Programs and Facilities.	Planning & Development and Parks & Recreation
d) Information on Idenfified Community Preferences for Particular Resources.	Planning & Development and Parks & Recreation

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION UTILIZE THE COMPREHENSIVE DATA BASE MENTIONED IN RECOMMENDATION NO. 1 TO UNDERTAKE A STUDY OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF CURRENT RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS, IDENTIFY FUTURE NEEDS AND DEMANDS FOR

THESE SERVICES AND INVESTIGATE PROCEDURES FOR PROJECTING LONG TERM CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.

3. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION TAKE THE LEAD ROLE IN SETTING OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OR APPROPRIATE REDISTRIBUTION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF THE STUDY AND THIS SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN IN A WAY THAT PROVIDES FOR CONSULTATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE PUBLIC AND SERVICE AGENCIES.

4. THE PROCEDURES AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "F" BE ADOPTED FOR USE IN ASSESSING PROPOSALS FOR NEW FACILITY DEVELOPMENT.

5. AN INTER-AGENCY WORKING GROUP COMPOSED OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AND THE AGENCIES PROVIDING RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE AREA BORDERED BY LAKE SHORE BOULEVARD, UNIVERSITY AVENUE, BLOOR STREET AND DUFFERIN STREET BE ESTABLISHED TO DEVELOP A MODEL FOR CO-ORDINATING THE PROVISION OF SERVICES.

PROGRAM PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION

1. CITY OPERATED RECREATION CENTRES, CITY-FUNDED COMMUNITY CENTRES AND AGENCIES RECEIVING GRANTS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION BE EXPECTED TO ANNUALLY DEMONSTRATE THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAMS OFFERED TO THE COMPREHENSIVE RECREATION DATA BASE AND THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO SUCH CENTRES IN THE USE OF THIS INFORMATION.

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION ESTABLISH CITIZEN ADVISORY COUNCILS IN ALL OF ITS PERMANENT RECREATION CENTRES BY SEPTEMBER 1983.

3. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION UNDERTAKE PILOT PROJECTS TO EXAMINE WAYS OF IMPROVING ITS OUTREACH CAPABILITIES, PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF FACILITIES BY ETHNIC MINORITIES.

4. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION PROVIDE A RECEPTION CAPABILITY AT ONE OF ITS RECREATION FACILITIES ON A TWO-YEAR PILOT PROJECT BASIS AND EVALUATE THE EXTENT THAT THIS INCREASES UTILIZATION AND IMPROVES ACCESS TO PROGRAM INFORMATION OF THE CENTRE AND GENERAL CITY-WIDE SERVICES AND THAT $11,500 BE APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE AND THE DEPARTMENT INCLUDE THIS AMOUNT IN THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE REQUESTS FOR THIS PURPOSE.

5. ALL CITY-FUNDED AGENCIES BE REQUIRED TO REPORT ON THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEIR PROGRAMS ARE DESIGNED TO SERVE ETHNIC MINORITIES WITHIN THE NEIGHBOURHOODS THEY SERVE.

MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

1. CITY-FUNDED COMMUNITY CENTRES ADOPT A SET OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION AND OPERATION OF BOARDS OF MANAGEMENT CONSISTENT WITH THE GUIDELINES SET OUT IN APPENDIX "E" BY JANUARY 1, 1983.

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION PRESENT FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION A PROPOSED POLICY ON THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ADVISORY COUNCILS BY APRIL 30, 1983.

3. CITY-OPERATED RECREATION CENTRES AND CITY-FUNDED COMMUNITY CENTRES BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING A STATEMENT OF CENTRE

LEVEL OBJECTIVES AND OBJECTIVES FOR MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984. THESE OBJECTIVES SHALL BE FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD AND SHALL BE SUFFICIENTLY SPECIFIC AND MEASURABLE TO PERMIT A DETERMINATION OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEY ARE ACHIEVED.

4. THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES DEVELOP A PLAN AND PRIORITIES BY DECEMBER 1, 1982 FOR THE PROVISION OF TECHNICAL SERVICES AND EXPERTISE TO ASSIST IN THE PROCESS DESCRIBED IN RECOMMENDATION NO. 3.

5. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION AND THE ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY CENTRES DEVELOP FORMATS FOR THE ANNUAL REPORTING OF CONCISE PROGRAM INFORMATION FOR EACH FACILITY BY SEPTEMBER 1983.

PROVISION OF INFORMATION

1. THE CITY PRODUCE A DIRECTORY OF SERVICES IN 1983 WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE PRESENT DIRECTORY PRODUCED BY THE PUBLIC INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SERVICES DIVISION AND THE BROCHURES PRODUCED BY THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT AT AN INCREASE OF NO MORE THAN $15,000 OVER EXISTING BUDGETED ITEMS BE APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE AND THE DIVISION INCLUDE THIS AMOUNT IN THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE REQUESTS.

2. THIS DIRECTORY ALSO INCLUDE A LIST OF PROGRAMS PRODUCED BY THE SEVEN COMMUNITY CENTRES, THE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSES AND THE FOUR BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUBS, AND THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO INCLUDING PROGRAMS OF ALL GROUPS WHO RECEIVE CITY GRANTS AND OTHER AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE.

3. THE DIRECTORY INCLUDE A LIST OF THIRTY TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE VARIOUS NEIGHBOURHOOD INFORMATION CENTRES WITHIN THE CITY OF TORONTO.

4. THE COVER, OR FIRST PAGE INCLUDE "ENQUIRY DIRECTIVES" IN THE FIVE LANGUAGES (ITALIAN, GREEK, PORTUGUESE, CHINESE AND FRENCH) SERVED BY THE CITY'S LANGUAGES BUREAU WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO CALL 367-7347 (THE LANGUAGES BUREAU) FOR FURTHER INFORMATION IN A PARTICULAR LANGUAGE.

5. THIS DIRECTORY BE SO PRODUCED THAT IT WILL NOT EXCEED THE WEIGHT LIMITS IMPOSED BY THE POST OFFICE FOR THIRD CLASS MAIL.

6. THE DIRECTORY BE DELIVERED TO EVERY RESIDENTIAL UNIT IN TORONTO (302,811 UNITS) BY THE POSTAL SERVICE.

7. THE TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY BOARD BE INVITED TO BUY INTO THE DIRECTORY IN 1984, PROVIDED THE TOTAL WEIGHT OF THE BOOKLET DOES NOT EXCEED 113.4 GRAMS.

IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND DEVELOPMENT

1. THE CITY ESTABLISH AN IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE FOR THE PERIOD AUGUST 1, 1982 - JUNE 30, 1985 WITH A MANDATE AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "G", AND THE TASK FORCE BE COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING:

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES	ORGANIZATIONAL AFFILIATION
1	Association of Community Centres

1	Toronto Association of Neighbourhood Services
1	Boys' and Girls' Clubs
1	Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants
1	Y.M.C.A.
1	Recreation Centre Advisory Councils
1	Grant Review Board Recipient Agencies (Selected at a meeting for this purpose)
2	Council
1	Department of Parks and Recreation
1	Department of Planning & Development
1	Department of Management Services
1	Toronto Board of Education
1	Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board
14	

2. BY MARCH 1985, THE TASK FORCE SHALL PREPARE A REPORT TO INCLUDE:

   A. STATUS REPORT ON ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE ON NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES.

   B. THE NEED FOR AND STRUCTURE OF AN ON-GOING ADVISORY BODY.

3. THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE BE GIVEN THE SUPPORT OF TWO CONTRACT STAFF PERSONS:

   (a) CO-ORDINATOR
   (b) AGENCY RESOURCE OFFICER

   THAT THE CO-ORDINATOR BE HIRED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE; THAT FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $8,250 BE PROVIDED FOR THIS PURPOSE; THAT $20,625 BE PROVIDED IN 1983 FOR THE HIRING OF THE AGENCY RESOURCE OFFICER AS OF APRIL 1, 1983, AND $24,750 FOR THE FULL YEAR IMPACT OF THE CO-ORDINATOR'S POSITION; $2,125 FOR SUPPORT COSTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE ARE REQUIRED IN 1982 AND THE FULL YEAR IMPACT IN 1983 WILL BE $6,375.

4. THE JOB DESCRIPTIONS AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "G" BE ADOPTED IN PRINCIPLE.

I. INTRODUCTION

In the summer of 1981, Toronto City Council established the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services. The 12-member Task Force is composed of representatives of Council, local Boards of Education, the Department of Parks and Recreation, the Advisory Boards of City-operated Recreation Centres and City-supported community agencies. The Task Force has been requested by Council to undertake a review and to prepare a report with recommendations for Council by June 1982 on the following major issues:

- An overall policy statement with respect to the City's commitment to the support of social and recreational services,
- Appropriate roles of City Departments and community agencies and organizations in the provision of services, and
- Appropriate policies, criteria, procedures and organizational structures for the City's provision or support of such services. (See Appendix A for detailed Task Force mandate).

This document is the final report of the Task Force.

II. ORGANIZATION OF REPORT

To permit the reader to easily select the degree of detail he/she wishes to consider in reviewing this report, it has been organized into six parts. The nature of each part is as follows:

- Overview and Summary of Recommendations - This is a brief summary of the 11-month activity of the Task Force, the issues identified, the general goals the recommendations are intended to achieve and a listing of the recommendations of the Task Force.
- Context of City Policy - This is Section III and it provides a description of the current roles the City plays in the provision and support of community and recreational services and the broader environment of needs and services within which City policy presently operates.
- Section IV - X - These sections focus on the seven major issues areas identified by the Task Force. Each section contains a brief description of specific issues, a proposed statement of policy that would guide future City activity and a series of specific recommendations. These sections provide a more detailed description of the issues and rationale underlying the recommendations than is found in the overview.
- Section XI - This is a detailed report on the estimated cost impact of the Task Force recommendations over the period October 1982 - December 1985.
- Appendices A-G - These appendices are composed of supplementary information not included in the main text and proposed policy guidelines for specific aspects of the City's provision and/or support of community and recreational services. A number of recommendations in the main text request adoption of these particular documents.
- Appendix H - This is a background paper that contains detailed descriptions and statistical information on types of organizations providing service, programs, financial involvement of the City, use of volunteers and issues arising from a review of the literature and relevant socio-demographic data. This paper is available on request from the Task Force.

III. CONTEXT OF CITY POLICY

In addition to the diversity of ages, cultures, life styles, income and recreation needs of City residents, Toronto contains a variety of organizations that offer a broad range of recreational and community programmes. The City is only one of many organizations that provide recreational opportunities and it is only one of a number of sources of financial support for various neighbourhood and community service agencies. The local Boards of Education provide public access to school facilities and these are used extensively for various recreational purposes. Toronto also contains dozens of neighbourhood groups and a host of voluntary agencies that contribute significantly to the availability of services. Some of these agencies have histories of service that began at the turn of the century. It need also be remembered that families themselves provide mutual support and organize recreational experiences for individual family members and

they frequently purchase recreational programs from various commercial enterprises and privately-owned clubs.

The City of Toronto currently allocates public monies to parks, recreational and community service programs in three ways which are:

1. The financing of parks, facilities and recreation programs owned, leased or operated under permit or agreement and maintained by the City through its Parks and Recreation Department. This also includes shared use agreements with the local Boards of Education.

2. The provision of grants to local non-profit groups and organizations that provide community or recreational programs to City residents. In 1981, 93 organizations received such grants from the City.

3. The funding of "core administrative" costs of seven Community Centres owned by the City and operated by Boards of Management established under a Council by-law and composed of local residents.

The nature of these three funding arrangements, the organizations affected by them and the strengths and weaknesses of each were the primary matters reviewed by the Task Force.

The ways in which the City either directly provides or supports the provision of programs have their own unique histories and patterns of development. For example, in 1960, City Council adopted a recreation policy in which it was stated that:

> "The provision of recreation is a basic human necessity ranking equally as important as other services rendered free of charge to the citizenry such as health and welfare, and that the administration has a responsibility to make available to all citizens maximum opportunity for the enjoyable satisfying and creative use of leisure time without regard to race, creed, colour, age or social and economic levels".

By 1981, the Department of Parks and Recreation had effected a reasonable distribution of recreation facilities and programs across the City. In addition to the direct provision of programs in these facilities, use by external organizations has been increasing steadily over the years. It is to the City's credit that a range of basic recreational opportunities are available without charge to City residents. For more than 30 years, a mechanism has also existed whereby the Department and local School Boards can enter into shared use agreements to further promote the availability of facilities for public recreational use.

For many years Council has made grants available to local community groups and agencies providing a variety of social and recreational services. While most of these grants have been relatively small, frequently constituting less than 10% of the agency's budget, they have often been vital to the continuation of a program. A variety of other arrangements have often been made with local agencies, such as sharing in maintenance costs, that again have ensured the continuation of a valuable service. When recognition is made of the thousands of volunteer hours that these organizations contribute to the community and the significant financial resources they muster through their own efforts, the effect of City support has been to increase the dollar value of services provided far beyond the actual amount of grant funds made available.

In the mid 1970's, the City became involved in the core administrative funding of 'Community Centres'. While this initiative does not appear to have emerged from a conscious policy of fostering the development of neighbourhood-based multi-service centres, it might be argued that it was a logical response to such factors as:

- A renewed emphasis upon 'neighbourhoods' that has pervaded the interest of Council and local residents since the late 1960's,

- The inability of traditional funding sources such as the United Way to financially support the development of new neighbourhood centres,

- An interest in making use of City-owned buildings and delegating to Boards of Management the responsibility of operating programs suited to local needs.

In addition to providing a range of needed programs and services within their neighbourhoods, these centres provide a focal point for community involvement, self-help and volunteerism. This unique combination of opportunties, availability of specific programs plus personal involvement in the life of their neighbourhood, has resulted in the bustling nature of these centres.

While these existing arrangements permit the City to exercise considerable flexibility in facilitating the provision and support of a variety of organizations and programs, there is a need to ensure that these various approaches have both a coherent rationale and a means for co-ordinating actual delivery of programs. The development of such a rationale and the appropriate policies and structures for implementation have been the primary focus of the Task Force. In the view of the Task Force, the ultimate goal should be a set of roles and partnerships between the public and voluntary sectors that:

- recognizes the diversity of needs of City residents and facilitates a spectrum of programs provided in a variety of different settings,
- promotes full utilization of existing facilities and programs,
- maximizes the total resources, including individual self-initiative, volunteers and community fund-raising, that can be mobilized in the provision of services, and
- achieves the greatest level and quality of services possible given finite City financial resources.

IV. ROLES OF THE CITY

A. Issues:

As set out in the original mandate, the Task Force was requested to propose a policy with respect to the City's commitment to social and recreational services. The Task Force was further requested to determine the extent to which the City should directly provide services and the circumstances where it is appropriate for the City to support the voluntary sector to provide such services.

Two major difficulties arise with respect to the consideration of an appropriate role(s) for the City. The first is the definition or scope of activities that should be encompassed by the terms "recreational" and "social" services. Related to the definitional problem, is the appropriate role of local government vis-a-vis other funding bodies with respect to the provision or support of programs in these areas of human service.

While the Task Force believes the term "recreation" may lend itself to some reasonably useful definition, the term "social services" is particularly problematic. This term is normally associated with established programs (e.g., income security, social assistance, child welfare, day care, homes for the aged), which are recognized as the responsibility of other levels of government.

There are, however, a number of services and programs offered by a variety of formal and more informal organizations that do not fall within the category of established "social services". These might be more appropriately referred to as "community services" and they include such things as:

- Tax Clinics
- Legal Aid Clinics
- Language and Communication Services for Immigrants
- Aid to New Mothers
- Information and Resource Centres
- Parent/Child Resource Centres
- Summer Day Camps
- Youth Employment Centres

These services may be of a very local nature and they frequently are initiated by either residents of a particular neighbourhood or by persons sharing common problems or concerns.

As for the difference, an attempt to draw a distinction between recreation and community services may obscure more than it would clarify. Where such distinctions have been attempted, the difference is more often associated with the organizations providing the activities than the

activities themselves. There might be general agreement that the organization of a hockey league, the provision of a swimming program or the development of a drama club would be seen as recreation. Likewise, the provision of a legal aid clinic, a tenant hotline or a meals-on-wheels service might be seen as a "community service". However, provision of a drop-in centre for senior citizens or youth cannot be categorized neatly as being exclusively one or the other.

With respect to the jurisdictional issue, local government is widely recognized as having a primary role in both the direct provision of recreation programs and the support of such programs provided by voluntary organizations.

"Social service" programs are generally within the jurisdiction of senior levels of government and have a legislative base that prescribes their responsibilities. At present, Metropolitan Toronto shares responsibility with the Province in a number of such programs. It is the view of the Task Force that the City should not seek to assume responsibility for the provision or support of such programs. It should, however, seek to ensure that such services are organized, adequately financed and delivered by those responsible in ways that best serve the needs of City residents.

In the area of "community services", the appropriate roles of local government are unclear. On the one hand, various levels of government and other organizations such as the United Way have either more widely recognized mandates for these types of programs or historical patterns of financial support to City-located service agencies. At the same time, the City has provided limited grant support to such programs where eligibility for support from other funding bodies was unclear. Given the involvement of other funding bodies in the support of community service programs, the City should actively pursue the delineation of clear funding responsibilities of such bodies to ensure the most appropriate use of limited resources of the City.

Particularly in light of the difficulties of establishing a clear-cut distinction between recreation and community services and the jurisdictional problems surrounding the latter, the Task Force considered three options for defining an overall City role with respect to these two service areas. The three options were:

1. City assumes major responsibility for the provision and support of recreation services only.

2. City assumes primary role in recreation services and secondary role in community services.

3. City assumes equal roles and responsibilities for both types of services.

Option 1 was deemed inappropriate because it assumes that a clear-cut distinction can be made. Also, it would logically entail the discontinuance of funding for a variety of needed programs for which there is no generally recognized alternative source of support.

Option 3 was rejected because it would likely result in financial demands being placed upon the City that would be inappropriate and would relieve other funding bodies of their responsibilities.

Option 2 is a maintenance of the status quo. It is the view of the Task Force that the City should not assume unqualified responsibility for the support of such programs nor should it directly provide them. The City's support for community services should be very specific and should include a role in advocating to ensure that other funding bodies assume responsibility for and provide adequate support for local programs.

Option 2 was considered to be the most feasible approach in that it achieves the following:

1. Reaffirms the role of the City as a direct provider of recreational facilities and programs only.

2. Recognizes the valuable roles played by voluntary agencies in the provision of recreational services and establishes a clear responsibility of the City to support the provision of programs by these agencies.

3. Provides an opportunity to improve recreational planning and expand the variety of program opportunities.

4. Establishes a policy position that other community and governmental funding bodies must continue to meet their commitments and responsibilities for specific community and social service programs within their mandates.

5. Recognizes a variety of roles the City can play with respect to facilitating and supporting the development and operation of community service agencies.

6. Provides a more clearly stated policy for the City and retains its historical commitments.

7. Establishes a clearer basis upon which to develop specific policies for carrying out these two areas of responsibilities.

In light of the distinction between primary and secondary responsibilities, it would appear appropriate to establish two policies that set out different roles for the City with respect to these two types of services.

B. Guiding Principles

As a guide to the implementation of the recommended City roles in recreation and community services contained in Section C, the Task Force developed the following statement of policy principles:

> "That the City recognizes a commitment and a series of ways in which it can support the availability of recreation and community services that are designed to improve the quality and well-being of individual, family and neighbourhood life of City residents. It further recognizes that a clear distinction between recreation and community services cannot be easily drawn with respect to many activities and it will promote and support the development of a universally accessible system of recreation and community services that contains a diversity of organizations, facilities, services and programs.
>
> With respect to the availability of recreational opportunities, the City shall endeavour to directly provide and manage a range of basic recreational facilities and programs to City residents. It further recognizes and will continue to support the provision of recreational programs by local voluntary agencies and organizations through a variety of means. With respect to the voluntary sector, the City will utilize various methods of providing financial and other support that differentiate between large organizations providing significant levels of recreation programming on an on-going basis and those programs serving special population groups or operate on a seasonal basis.
>
> The City further recognizes the vital contribution to individual, family and neighbourhood well-being made by a variety of community service agencies. Where need has been demonstrated, the City will continue to facilitate the development of multi-purpose neighbourhood centres and agencies providing community services to City residents. While the City continues to see the primary responsibility for the financing of specific programs resting with other community and governmental funding bodies, the City will continue to provide specific types of support and assistance to ensure the viability of these valued services. It will further pursue with other funding bodies the assumption of their funding responsibilities with respect to City located programs.
>
> It is further recognized that the resources the City will commit to recreation and community service programs will be subject to the specific determination of Council through established budgetary approval procedures."

C. Recommendations

With respect to the City's role in recreation services, it is recommended that:

1. WHEREAS RECREATION INCLUDES ALL OF THOSE ACTIVITIES IN WHICH AN INDIVIDUAL CHOOSES TO PARTICIPATE IN HIS/HER LEISURE TIME AND IS NOT CONFINED SOLELY TO SPORTS AND PHYSICAL RECREATION PROGRAMS BUT INCLUDES ARTISTIC, CREATIVE, CULTURAL, SOCIAL, INTELLECTUAL, EDUCATIONAL AND NEIGHBOURHOOD BETTERMENT ACTIVITIES.

   AND WHEREAS RECREATION IS A FUNDAMENTAL HUMAN NEED FOR CITIZENS OF ALL AGES AND INTERESTS AND FOR BOTH SEXES AND IS ESSENTIAL TO THEIR PSYCHOLOGICAL, SOCIAL AND PHYSICAL WELL-BEING.

AND WHEREAS CITY COUNCIL RECOGNIZES THAT RECREATION IS A SOCIAL SERVICE IN THE SAME WAY THAT HEALTH AND EDUCATION ARE CONSIDERED AS SOCIAL SERVICES, THE PURPOSES OF WHICH ARE TO (A) ASSIST INDIVIDUAL AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT; (B) IMPROVE THE QUALITY OF LIFE; AND (C) ENHANCE SOCIAL FUNCTIONING,

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY SHALL DIRECTLY PROVIDE AND MANAGE THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION A RANGE OF BASIC RECREATION FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS FREE OF CHARGE TO CITY RESIDENTS, CONTINUE TO UTILIZE SHARED USE AGREEMENTS WITH LOCAL BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND FINANCIALLY ASSIST OR OTHERWISE SUPPORT THE PROVISION OF RECREATION PROGRAMS OFFERED BY VOLUNTARY ORGANIZATIONS, AGENCIES AND COMMUNITY CENTRES SO AS TO ENSURE THAT ALL CITIZENS HAVE MAXIMUM OPPORTUNITY FOR THE ENJOYABLE, SATISFYING AND CREATIVE USE OF LEISURE TIME.

With respect to the City's role in community services, it is recommended that:

2. WHEREAS COMMUNITY SERVICES CONSIST OF A BROAD RANGE OF PROGRAMS TO HELP INDIVIDUALS AND FAMILIES TO GAIN ACCESS TO BASIC RESOURCES AND INSTITUTIONS OF OUR SOCIETY, BRING PEOPLE TOGETHER FOR MUTUAL SUPPORT, PROVIDE OPPORTUNITIES FOR VOLUNTARY PARTICIPATION, FURTHER INTERCULTURAL RELATIONS AND PROMOTE THE SOCIAL FOUNDATIONS OF NEIGHBOURHOODS, ALL OF WHICH ARE ESSENTIAL TO THE QUALITY OF CITY LIFE.

   AND WHEREAS COUNCIL HAS DEMONSTRATED A COMMITMENT TO THE DEVELOPMENT OF MULTI-PURPOSE NEIGHBOURHOOD CENTRES/COMMUNITY CENTRES BY THE PROVISION OF CORE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING.

   AND WHEREAS COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED FOR MANY YEARS GENERAL GRANTS TO A VARIETY OF COMMUNITY SERVICE AGENCIES.

   AND WHEREAS COUNCIL HAS PROVIDED OTHER MEANS OF SUPPORT SUCH AS USE OF CITY-OWNED BUILDINGS AND SHARING OF MAINTENANCE COSTS.

   THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED THAT THE CITY SHALL FACILITATE AND SUPPORT THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES TO AS WIDE A RANGE OF TORONTO RESIDENTS AS POSSIBLE AND IT SHALL UNDERTAKE TO SUPPORT SUCH SERVICES WHERE NEED HAS BEEN DEMONSTRATED THROUGH SUCH MEANS AS:

   A. THE USE OF SPACE IN CITY-OWNED BUILDINGS.

   B. THE PROMOTION OF SHARING OF NON-FINANCIAL RESOURCES AND EXPERTISE AMONG AGENCIES, E.G., JOINTLY SPONSORED RESEARCH PROJECTS, SHARING OF EQUIPMENT FOR SPECIAL EVENTS, ACCESS TO STAFF DEVELOPMENT AND TRAINING PROGRAMS, ETC.

   C. THE PROVISION OF ADMINISTRATIVE AND TECHNICAL SUPPORT TO LOCAL AGENCIES.

   D. THE ADVOCACY OF FINANCIAL SUPPORT FROM COMMUNITY AND GOVERNMENTAL FUNDING BODIES.

   E. THE PROVISION OF CORE ADMINISTRATIVE FUNDING OF MULTI-PURPOSE COMMUNITY CENTRES ESTABLISHED BY CITY BY-LAW AND MANAGED BY LOCAL BOARDS OF MANAGEMENT.

   F. THE SUPPORT AND/OR UNDERTAKING OF NEEDS AND RESOURCES STUDIES AT THE NEIGHBOURHOOD LEVEL.

   G. THE PROVISION OF DIRECT FINANCIAL SUPPORT THROUGH GENERAL GRANTS WHERE COMMUNITY SERVICE NEEDS HAVE BEEN CLEARLY IDENTIFIED AND OTHER SOURCES OF SUPPORT ARE NOT AVAILABLE.

H. THE AMENDMENT OF THE CURRENT PRIORITIES FOR THE USE OF CITY-OPERATED RECREATION FACILITIES ACCORDING TO APPENDIX "B" SO AS TO PERMIT THE PROVISION OF COMMUNITY SERVICES BY EXTERNAL ORGANIZATIONS AT THESE LOCATIONS.

I. THE PROVISION OF OTHER FORMS OF SUPPORT AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE BY COUNCIL.

V. CITY FUNDING POLICY

A. ISSUES

After setting out what the Task Force viewed as appropriate roles for the City with respect to both recreation and community services, it examined the kind of funding policies and approaches needed to carry out these roles effectively.

Over the years the City has developed a number of arrangements for the financing of facilities and/or programs. In addition to the provision of funds to the Department of Parks and Recreation for the direct management of facilities and delivery of programs, a number of organization or facility-specific arrangements have been made. These include the assumption of facility maintenance costs by the City, the permanent use of a City-owned building by a voluntary organization at token expense or leasing charge and the operation or financing of a recreation portion of the facility, e.g., pool, otherwise owned or operated by a voluntary organization. These arrangements appear to benefit the City, the organization and the consumer and the Task Force is not recommending any alterations to these specific arrangements.

The Task Force focused its attention primarily upon the provision of grants to voluntary agencies and the City's financing of core administrative costs of Community Centres. This focus resulted from a perception that these two funding methods had strong potential as long as a number of existing problems could be resolved.

1. City Grants

The City provides such grants under two categories: General and Recreational. Over the years Council has established various procedures and review bodies to examine grant applications and make recommendations. In January 1977, a Grant Review Board, composed of three aldermen and reporting to Council through the Neighbourhoods Committee, was established to oversee both types of grants.

In 1981, the Grant Review Board recommended allocations to 49 of the 63 organizations that applied for General grants and 44 of the 57 organizations that applied for Recreational grants. The total amounts allocated to these two areas were $180,720 (General) and $379,450 (Recreation). For the most part, the grants represent only a minor portion of the total revenues of the recipient agencies—generally less than 10%.

The primary issues identified by the Task Force and to which recommendations are addressed are as follows:

- The lack of clarity with respect to the types of services appropriate for City support versus support from other funding bodies.

  For example, in 1981 21 of the organizations recommended for City General grant support also received grants from Metro for essentially the same programs. Adequate funding of these and similar community service programs located in the city should be actively pursued with the Metropolitan Toronto Department of Community Services.

- A number of benefits to be gained in creating a two-tiered system of Recreation grants that distinguishes between

  1. Comparatively large organizations that:

     - provide a multitude of services and programmes, usually on a neighbourhood basis.

- apply to the City for a grant to provide recreation programs as part of their overall array of services.

- provide these recreation programs on a year-round and year-to-year basis and most have been doing so for many years.

2. Comparatively smaller agencies or community groups that:

- may be requesting only one-time funding.

- are organized to provide only the program for which they are seeking grant funds; i.e., they are not multi-purpose organizations with diversified programs and funding sources.

- may often have no full-time or paid staff.

- propose to provide a program or service of a seasonal nature.

- propose to serve a specialized population.

For example, in 1981, 15 organizations received grants in excess of $10,000.00 for a total of $264,300.00 (70% of total recreation grant funds recommended for allocation). The remaining 29 organizations received $115,150.00. The average grant per organization in the first group was $17,620.00 and in the second group, $3,971.00.

While both types of organizations provide needed programs, a grant system that established a closer link between the larger organizations and the Department of Parks and Recreation could provide the City with a broader range of alternatives for meeting local recreation needs, enhance the public and voluntary sector partnership and give greater stability to the financing of established programs.

- The need to more closely match grants to demonstrated financial need and elevate the importance of grants to voluntary agencies as an integral part of the City's approach to the support of recreation programs.

Unlike the development of other Civic budgets, the Grant Review Board budget is not developed from the known needs of the year in which funds are to be allocated. Consequently, the Board is always in the difficult position of having to forecast its future requirements without the benefit of any concrete information. This contributes to the perception that the provision of grants is an incidental part of the City's planning and budgetary procedures.

In the opinion of the Task Force, the City's support of the voluntary sector must be seen as an integral part of the "system" for delivering services. Otherwise, the City's ability to ensure that needs are met in the most effective way possible will be seriously jeopardized.

The Task Force also undertook a review of all the 1981 applications for City grant support to determine the adequacy of grant support. The major observations arising from this review are:

a. the financial base upon which adjustments for inflation have been made are inadequate in many instances and that in the area of recreation grants this shortfall for 1982 is likely to be at least $35,000.

b. agencies perceive there to be little or no incentive to spend much effort in documenting their specific financial needs after the first year of approval since their experience frequently has been that no amount beyond inflation will be granted anyway.

c. the City is in effect making up for the inadequacies of grants from other funding bodies with respect to a number of organizations receiving General grants. While this practice ensures the continuation of needed organizations, it means a diversion of funds from more appropriate areas of City support.

2. Core Administrative Funding of Community Centres

The issues surrounding the City's funding of Board of Management operated Community Centres was the most critical reason for the formation of the Task Force. The funding of the first two Centres in 1974 did not appear to occur as a result of a conscious decision to develop a particular type of neighbourhood-based facility that would provide a range of recreation and community service programs. What began as two specific decisions based on two particular circumstances has grown to something of greater significance.

The lack of an initial policy to support the establishment of such Centres and to place them in a broader context of City policy appears to have significantly contributed to an aura of ambivalence on the part of City and a sense of an uncertain future on the part of Centres. The relationships have at times been acrimonious and specific policy-making has often occurred as a result of perceived crises.

It need also be recognized that the Centres themselves have changed dramatically from relatively small, program specific organizations to, in most cases, well-established multi-purpose neighbourhood centres providing a broad range of community programs. This transition has created internal pressures upon Boards and staff as the need for more sophisticated policy-making, management and program development capabilities grew.

In the view of the Task Force, Community Centres play a unique and valuable role in the provision of services to City residents. They combine both community and recreation services and they offer the latter in a style based on local initiative and volunteerism. For this reason, they contribute to the diversity of programs necessary in Toronto. Therefore, the recommendations of the Task Force are focused on how to enhance the capacities of these Centres to operate effectively and to provide the City with a framework of policy and procedures for handling proposals for new development.

The specific problems to which the recommendations are addressed are:

- The need for written policies and objective criteria with respect to the specific meaning of core administrative funding.
- The need to develop a basis upon which to consider requests for a volunteer co-ordinator to become part of the core staff of a centre.
- The recognition that an overly incremental approach to the funding seriously inhibits the capacity of Centres to operate effectively and efficiently.
- The need for Centres to adopt some basic constitutional guidelines.
- The need to provide Centre staff and Boards with a variety of non-financial resources and development opportunities.
- The need to establish a more effective working relationship between the Centres and Civic Departments and other community agencies.

No statement of guiding principles has been developed for this section because they are included in Section IV and the related appendices.

B. Recommendations

With respect to the provision of grant support to local voluntary agencies, it is recommended that:

1. THE CITY PROVIDE GRANTS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION TO VOLUNTARY AGENCIES, ORGANIZATIONS AND COMMUNITY CENTRES FOR THE PROVISION OF DESIGNATED RECREATION PROGRAMS OF AN ON-GOING NATURE ACCORDING TO THE POLICIES AND PROCEDURES AS SET OUT IN APPENDIX C.

2. FOR THE FISCAL YEAR 1983, ON-GOING RECREATIONAL PROGRAMS PROVIDED BY COMMUNITY AGENCIES WHICH HAD BEEN SUPPORTED BY RECREATIONAL

GRANTS FROM THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD IN EXCESS OF $10,000.00 IN 1982 SHALL BE FINANCED THROUGH DEPARTMENTAL GRANTS AND THE EVALUATION AND REPORTING PROCESS WILL COMMENCE FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984.

3. THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD CONTINUE TO PROVIDE SPECIFIC RECREATIONAL GRANTS UNDER THE CURRENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES WHERE THE AMOUNT GRANTED IS LESS THAN $10,000.00 AND TO RECOMMEND WHERE PROGRAMS SHOULD BE FUNDED THROUGH DEPARTMENTAL GRANTS AS REVISED AND CONTAINED IN APPENDIX D.

4. THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE REQUESTS OF THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD INCLUDE:

   a. AN AMOUNT TO ADJUST THE BASE BUDGETS OF CURRENTLY FUNDED RECREATION PROGRAMS IN ORDER TO MATCH THE LEVEL OF SUPPORT WITH DEMONSTRATED FINANCIAL NEED AND THAT AT LEAST $35,000 BE INCLUDED FOR THIS PURPOSE

   b. AN INFLATIONARY ADJUSTMENT TO THE 1982 BUDGET

   c. AN AMOUNT TO PERMIT THE FUNDING OF NEW PROGRAMS

   AND THESE AMOUNTS BE DEVELOPED BY THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD IN CONSULTATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION AND THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE.

5. THE CITY SHOULD CONTINUE TO EXPECT THAT OTHER FUNDING BODIES ACCEPT RESPONSIBILITY FOR THE ADEQUATE FUNDING OF SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS FOR WHICH THEY HAVE HAD AN HISTORIC INVOLVEMENT OR PROVISIONS FOR THE SUPPORT OF SUCH PROGRAMS.

6. REPRESENTATIVES OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE, THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES AND THE GRANT REVIEW BOARD BE REQUESTED TO INITIATE DISCUSSIONS WITH THE METROPOLITAN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY SERVICES AND ANY OTHER FUNDING BODIES DEEMED APPROPRIATE TO DETERMINE MORE APPROPRIATE FUNDING RESPONSIBILITIES PARTICULARLY WITH RESPECT TO THE CITY'S PROVISION OF GENERAL GRANTS FOR SOCIAL AND COMMUNITY SERVICE PROGRAMS AND PREPARE A PROGRESS REPORT FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION BY DECEMBER 1, 1982.

7. THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE, IN CONSULTATION WITH COMMUNITY AGENCIES, PREPARE APPROPRIATE REVISIONS TO THE CURRENT POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CITY GRANTS IN LIGHT OF THE DISCUSSIONS REFERRED TO IN RECOMMENDATION NO. 6.

8. ANY PROPOSED CHANGES TO FUNDING CRITERIA OF THE CITY AND OTHER FUNDING BODIES BE SUBJECT TO PUBLIC CONSULTATION AND THE ADEQUATE FUNDING OF THOSE PROGRAMS AFFECTED.

With respect to Board of Management operated Community Centres, it is recommended that:

9. THE PROPOSED COMMUNITY CENTRE POLICY GUIDELINES CONTAINED IN APPENDIX E BE ADOPTED.

10. THE AMOUNT PROVIDED IN THE 1983 BUDGET FOR THE FUNDING OF COMMUNITY CENTRES INCLUDE THE $50,247.00 REQUIRED TO AUGMENT EXISTING STAFF LEVELS AS NOTED IN SECTION 3 OF SECTION XI OF THIS REPORT AND THE SPECIFIC ALLOCATIONS OF THIS AMOUNT BE SUBJECT TO APPROVAL OF THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE PHASE OF THE BUDGET.

VI. LONG-TERM PLANNING

A. Issues

With respect to the long-term facility and service planning capabilities, the Task Force identified the following problems:

- The lack of a comprehensive inventory of recreational facilities, community profiles for neighbourhoods served by facilities, utilization rates and needs assessment methodologies.
- The lack of a plan and set of objectives for the distribution of facility resources.
- The lack of written procedures and criteria to be used in the assessment of proposals for the development of Recreation or Community Centres.
- The need to assist in the development of responsive programs.
- The apparent lack of complementary relationships among Civic Departments involved in planning activities.
- The lack of models, policies or procedures for fully considering the capacity of the voluntary sector or co-ordinated approaches for meeting local needs through existing resources of the voluntary sector.

Given the number of areas from which participants at the public meetings indicated a perceived facility need, a stronger long-term planning capability and set of goals for the distribution of City recreation resources appears overdue. At present, there is not an adequate information base upon which to establish priority areas for future resource deployment.

B. Guiding Principles

As a guide to the development of the City resources to engage in long-term recreational and community service planning activities, the Task Force developed the following statement of policy principles:

> "It should be the responsibility of the City to gather sufficient data on facilities, programs, needs and likely demands for service to ensure informed decision-making with respect to future allocation of public monies. In addition to the collection and analysis of information, the City needs to develop a recreational and community service planning capability in order to ensure the distribution of resources according to some reasonably objective determination of priorities. Furthermore, this planning capability must ensure, given a policy based on a diversity of organizations and services, that current providers of services are involved in the planning processes that are established. It is understood that the development of data collection and planning capabilities by the City are intended to support the efforts by neighbourhood residents to design services that meet their unique needs and circumstances."

C. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION DEVELOP A COMPREHENSIVE DATA BASE ON FACILITIES, PROGRAMS AND NEEDS WHICH WILL INCLUDE:

TASK		RESPONSIBILITY
a)	an inventory of recreational facilities.	Parks & Recreation and Planning & Development.
b)	comprehensive community profiles for the neighbourhoods served by current recreational and community service facilities.	Planning & Development.

c)	attendance and participation rates for existing programs and facilities.	Planning & Development and Parks and Recreation.
d)	information on identified community preferences for particular resources	Planning & Development and Parks and Recreation.

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT, IN CO-OPERATION WITH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, UTILIZE THE COMPREHENSIVE DATA BASE MENTIONED IN RCOMMENDATION 1 TO UNDERTAKE A STUDY OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF CURRENT RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES NEEDS AND IDENTIFY FUTURE NEEDS AND DEMANDS FOR THESE SERVICES AND INVESTIGATE PROCEDURES FOR PROJECTING LONG TERM CAPITAL REQUIREMENTS.

3. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION TAKE THE LEAD ROLE IN SETTING OBJECTIVES AND PRIORITIES FOR THE DISTRIBUTION OR APPROPRIATE REDISTRIBUTION OF RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND PROGRAMS FOLLOWING THE COMPLETION OF THE STUDY, AND THIS SHOULD BE UNDERTAKEN IN A WAY THAT PROVIDES FOR CONSULTATION OPPORTUNITIES FOR THE PUBLIC AND SERVICE AGENCIES.

4. THE PROCEDURES AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX F BE ADOPTED FOR USE IN ASSESSING PROPOSALS FOR NEW FACILITY DEVELOPMENT.

5. AN INTERAGENCY WORKING GROUP COMPOSED OF REPRESENTATIVES OF THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION, THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AND THE AGENCIES PROVIDING RECREATION AND COMMUNITY SERVICES IN THE AREA BORDERED BY LAKESHORE BOULEVARD, UNIVERSITY AVENUE, BLOOR STREET AND DUFFERIN STREET BE ESTABLISHED TO DEVELOP A MODEL FOR CO-ORDINATING THE PROVISION OF SERVICES.

VII. PROGRAM PLANNING AND CO-ORDINATION

A. Issues

In the course of its review the Task Force noted the following problems with respect to the degree of co-ordination among various agencies in the planning and delivery of their programs:

- A serious lack of interaction between agencies at the neighbourhood level and little knowledge of one another's programs, particularly between the public and voluntary sectors but less so between various voluntary sector organizations.

- The need for relevant community statistical profiles for use by Recreation Centres, Community Centres and voluntary organizations in order to develop programs that are responsive to unique local needs.

- The lack of adequate mechanisms for neighbourhood residents to participate in the development of objectives and planning of programs in 8 of the 20 City-operated Recreation Centres.

- The existence of staffing patterns in Recreation Centres that limit outreach capabilities and may undermine access due to no reception function being adequately performed.

- The perceived lack of responsiveness to the unique recreational needs of ethnic minorities.

- The under-utilization of some existing facilities.

These problems do not stem from a lack of resources. Rather, they arise from the lack of on-going, day to day working relationships among the providers of service.

B. Guiding Principles

To guide the implementation of the recommendations regarding improved co-ordination of services, the Task Force developed the following statement of policy principles:

> "It should be the responsibility of individual agencies to ensure that programs have demonstrated relevance to the needs of the neighbourhoods in which they are located and to further consider the types of programs being offered by other local agencies. The City should ensure that directly operated and City-funded facilities establish adequate means to ensure that neighbourhood residents have opportunities to fully participate in decision-making with respect to the design, development and operation of such facilities. The City should also facilitate joint planning and program co-ordination at both the City-wide and neighbourhood level."

C. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. CITY OPERATED RECREATION CENTRES, CITY-FUNDED COMMUNITY CENTRES AND AGENCIES RECEIVING GRANTS THROUGH THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION BE EXPECTED TO ANNUALLY DEMONSTRATE THE RELATIONSHIP OF PROGRAMS OFFERED TO THE COMPREHENSIVE RECREATION DATA BASE AND THAT THE DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT PROVIDE ASSISTANCE TO SUCH CENTRES IN THE USE OF THIS INFORMATION.

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION ESTABLISH CITIZEN ADVISORY COUNCILS IN ALL OF ITS PERMANENT RECREATION CENTRES BY SEPTEMBER 1983.

3. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION UNDERTAKE PILOT PROJECTS TO EXAMINE WAYS OF IMPROVING ITS OUTREACH CAPABILITIES, PARTICULARLY WITH REGARD TO THE USE OF FACILITIES BY ETHNIC MINORITIES.

4. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION PROVIDE A RECEPTION CAPABILITY AT ONE OF ITS RECREATION FACILITIES ON A TWO YEAR PILOT PROJECT BASIS AND EVALUATE THE EXTENT THAT THIS INCREASES UTILIZATION AND IMPROVES ACCESS TO PROGRAM INFORMATION OF THE CENTRE AND GENERAL CITY-WIDE SERVICES AND THAT $11,500.00 BE APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE AND THE DEPARTMENT INCLUDE THIS AMOUNT IN THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE REQUESTS FOR THIS PURPOSE.

5. ALL CITY-FUNDED AGENCIES BE REQUIRED TO REPORT ON THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEIR PROGRAMS ARE DESIGNED TO SERVE ETHNIC MINORITIES WITHIN THE NEIGHBOURHOODS THEY SERVE.

VIII. MANAGEMENT AND ACCOUNTABILITY

A. Issues

The Task Force identified a number of problems with respect to the adequacy of current accountability requirements and the procedures and support resources required to ensure the effective management of resources. The most significant issues are:

- Lack of a common set of constitutional guidelines for Community Centres and a statement of roles and responsibilities of the Boards delegated to manage such Centres.
- Insufficient use of organizational objective setting and evaluation methodologies.
- Lack of the annual reporting of concise and useful program information by City-operated and funded Centres.
- Lack of policy with respect to the roles and responsibilities of Recreation Centres Advisory Councils.

- The need for provision of non-financial resources, particularly of a technical, staff development and training nature to enhance the capacities of existing programs to utilize their resources effectively.

- Lack of a range of organizational/management models for the operation of a facility where recreation and community service programs are of equal priority.

With respect to the roles and responsibilities of Recreation Centres Advisory Councils, the Department of Parks and Recreation had previously identified this problem and initiated a process involving Head Office staff, Centre staff and representatives of Advisory Councils to develop a clear policy in this area. The Task Force endorses this process which should culminate in the winter of 1983.

The Task Force was unable to give sufficient attention to the matter of various management models in joint community service and recreation facilities and is recommending that it be examined by the Implementation Task Force.

B. Guiding Principles

To guide the City's approach to the enhancement of the management of and accountability for the use of City resources, the following statement of policy principles was developed by the Task Force:

> "In all instances where services and programs are supported with City funds, Council should establish clear expectations with respect to the accounting of the uses of funds for the purposes intended. Where such funding is substantial, the City should establish guidelines and monitor the performance of agencies with respect to the adequacy of program and financial planning processes, the collection of program information and the use of program evaluation procedures in addition to the accounting for the use of public funds. All agencies receiving City funds, including directly-operated facilities, should annually report on the programs and services provided and the specific objectives these are designed to achieve. The City should make available technical support and expertise to strengthen the capacities of service providers to institute such procedures. It is equally important that facilities and programs establish mechanisms and clearly stated procedures for ensuring the relevance and quality of programs to local needs. Finally the City should support a variety of citizen participation models for the planning, development and operation of facilities and programs."

C. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. CITY-FUNDED COMMUNITY CENTRES ADOPT A SET OF CONSTITUTIONAL PROVISIONS AND PROCEDURES FOR THE SELECTION AND OPERATION OF BOARDS OF MANAGEMENT CONSISTENT WITH THE GUIDELINES SET OUT IN APPENDIX E BY JANUARY 1, 1983.

2. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION PRESENT FOR COUNCIL CONSIDERATION A PROPOSED POLICY ON THE ROLES AND RESPONSIBILITIES OF ADVISORY COUNCILS BY JANUARY 1, 1983.

3. CITY-OPERATED RECREATION CENTRES AND CITY-FUNDED COMMUNITY CENTRES BE RESPONSIBLE FOR DEVELOPING A STATEMENT OF CENTRE LEVEL OBJECTIVES AND OBJECTIVES FOR MAJOR PROGRAM AREAS FOR FISCAL YEAR 1984. THESE OBJECTIVES SHALL BE FOR A ONE YEAR PERIOD AND SHALL BE SUFFICIENTLY SPECIFIC AND MEASURABLE TO PERMIT A DETERMINATION OF THE EXTENT TO WHICH THEY ARE ACHIEVED.

4. THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE AND THE DEPARTMENT OF MANAGEMENT SERVICES DEVELOP A PLAN AND PRIORITIES BY DECEMBER 1, 1982 FOR THE PROVISION OF TECHNICAL SERVICES AND EXPERTISE TO ASSIST IN THE PROCESS DESCRIBED IN RECOMMENDATION NO. 3.

5. THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION AND THE ASSOCIATION OF COMMUNITY CENTRES DEVELOP FORMATS FOR THE ANNUAL REPORTING OF CONCISE PROGRAM INFORMATION FOR EACH FACILITY BY SEPTEMBER 1983.

IX. PROVISION OF INFORMATION

A. Issues

In every public consultation meeting held in February and March, the most commonly raised concern was the lack of information, easily accessible by the average resident, on programmes currently available. The Task Force also became aware of a research study undertaken in a large area of the west central part of the City which found that:

- 62% of the residents surveyed did not know of a single community facility, i.e., Recreation Centre, Library, Community Centre, in their neighbourhood.
- 17% knew of a Centre but not by name.
- 9% reported having used such a facility.

The lack of basic information may well be the single most important reason for the underutilization of current capacity.

While the Task Force is recommending the distribution of basic information to each household on an annual basis, this proposal should not be seen as the only form of information distribution to be supported. The provision of detailed information and direct one-to-one assistance to locate needed services is still more effectively handled at the neighbourhood level. The Task Force supports the efforts of individual Centre, local libraries, neighbourhood information centres and others who provide information in this more direct, personal and detailed manner.

B. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. THE CITY PRODUCE A DIRECTORY OF SERVICES IN 1983 WHICH WILL INCLUDE THE PRESENT DIRECTORY PRODUCED BY THE PUBLIC INFORMATION AND COMMUNICATION SERVICES DIVISION AND THE BROCHURES PRODUCED BY THE PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT AT AN INCREASE OF NO MORE THAN $15,000.00 OVER EXISTING BUDGETED ITEMS BE APPROVED IN PRINCIPLE AND THE DIVISION INCLUDE THIS AMOUNT IN THE 1983 PROGRAM CHANGE REQUESTS.

2. THIS DIRECTORY ALSO INCLUDE A LIST OF PROGRAMS PRODUCED BY THE SEVEN COMMUNITY CENTRES, THE NEIGHBOURHOOD HOUSES AND THE FOUR BOYS' AND GIRLS' CLUBS AND THAT CONSIDERATION BE GIVEN TO INCLUDING PROGRAMS OF ALL GROUPS WHO RECEIVE CITY GRANTS AND OTHER AGENCIES THAT PROVIDE NEIGHBOURHOOD SERVICES AS DEEMED APPROPRIATE.

3. THE DIRECTORY INCLUDE A LIST OF 30 TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARIES AND THE VARIOUS NEIGHBOURHOOD INFORMATION CENTRES WITHIN THE CITY OF TORONTO.

4. THE COVER, OR FIRST PAGE INCLUDE "ENQUIRY DIRECTIVES" IN THE FIVE LANGUAGES (ITALIAN, GREEK, PORTUGUESE, CHINESE AND FRENCH) SERVED BY THE CITY'S LANGUAGES BUREAU WITH INSTRUCTIONS TO CALL 367-7347 (THE LANGUAGES BUREAU) FOR FURTHER INFORMATION IN A PARTICULAR LANGUAGE.

5. THIS DIRECTORY BE SO PRODUCED THAT IT WILL NOT EXCEED THE WEIGHT LIMITS IMPOSED BY THE POST OFFICE FOR THIRD CLASS MAIL.

6. THE DIRECTORY BE DELIVERED TO EVERY RESIDENTIAL UNIT IN TORONTO (302,811 UNITS) BY THE POSTAL SERVICE.

7. THE TORONTO PUBLIC LIBRARY BOARD BE INVITED TO BUY INTO THE DIRECTORY IN 1984, PROVIDED THE TOTAL WEIGHT OF THE BOOKLET DOES NOT EXCEED 113.4 GRAMS.

X. IMPLEMENTATION, MONITORING AND DEVELOPMENT

A. Issues

The creation of the Task Force became much more than a means of conducting a review of current services. It secured for the first time a set of solid working relationships among the representatives of various Civic Departments and community agencies. It further established a process of extensive consultation, collective problem-solving and critical examination with respect to the strengths and weaknesses of existing services. This more co-operative set of relationships is the key to the City's potential to forge a diverse yet co-ordinated system of recreation and community service programs.

It also became evident that substantial resources, particularly in the area of human expertise, were being wasted through lack of recognition and the isolation of different sectors that has existed for so many years. A deficiency in the current system of services, and one for which a recommendation cannot be easily stated, is the lack of leadership. There is no focal point for defining and working on common goals, for drawing upon collective expertise, for providing mutual support and for seeking ways in which existing resources can be more effectively utilized.

With the submission of its final report, the Task Force will have accomplished the tasks as set before it by Council. The final report contains recommendations with respect to:

- The appropriate roles of the City in the provision and support of recreation and community services.
- The funding policies, approaches and procedures necessary to effectively support these City roles.
- A number of supplementary policy documents that set out detailed guidelines and procedures in key areas such as new facility planning, grants administration and the funding of Community Centres.
- A series of operational improvements that should be undertaken to enhance the responsiveness of programs, utilization and management of existing resources, access to information and greater co-ordination of planning and service delivery activities.

In addition, the Task Force has established a degree of interagency relationships that previously did not exist not only within the Task Force itself but through the consultation processes it utilized. The Task Force has also collected and consolidated considerable information of future use in specific areas such as the use of volunteers.

There are, however, a number of major activities that need to be undertaken to ensure that the opportunities for improvement are not lost and a number of remaining issues are effectively addressed. The outstanding activities that need to be undertaken in the short term are:

1. To build upon the improved interagency co-operation established by the Task Force and provide a focal point for the co-ordination of services and the resolution of problems at an administrative level.
2. To establish an inter-agency mechanism for monitoring progress on the recommendations made by the Task Force and adopted by Council and to propose appropriate remedial action where implementation difficulties arise.
3. To monitor, report and make recommendations on the general distribution of City recreational and community service resources and to specifically establish a means of reviewing proposals for new facility development.
4. To provide consultative assistance to all City operated and funded agencies with respect to the implementation of required changes.

5. To organize the use of non-financial resources and expertise available within Civic Departments and community agencies with respect to such matters as Board development, volunteer recruitment, fund-raising and ways of improving responsiveness of programs to special population groups, e.g., ethnic minorities.

6. To provide assistance to the Grant Review Board with respect to:

   a) delineation of funding responsibilities between the City and other funding bodies such as Metro.

   b) appropriate transfers between the two-tiered system of recreation grants.

   c) annual estimates for the overall level of grant support.

7. To develop program evaluation methodologies for use in City-funded agencies.

8. To research, develop and make recommendations for appropriate changes to the City's recreation and community service policies and procedures.

In the opinion of the Task Force, these activities fall into two categories: Co-ordination, policy development, monitoring and implementation assistance at the City-wide level, and extensive consultation and development assistance to a variety of the more than 100 agencies currently supported by the City. To ensure that these distinct but related tasks can be undertaken in an effective and co-ordinated manner, it is also the opinion of the Task Force that an interagency co-ordinating body of time limited duration needs to be established.

B. Recommendations

It is recommended that:

1. THE CITY ESTABLISH AN IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE FOR THE PERIOD AUGUST 1, 1982 - JUNE 30, 1985 WITH A MANDATE AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "G" AND THE TASK FORCE BE COMPOSED OF THE FOLLOWING.

NUMBER OF REPRESENTATIVES	ORGANIZATION AFFILIATION
1	Association of Community Centres
1	Toronto Assoc. of Neighbourhood Services
1	Boys' and Girls' Clubs
1	Ontario Council of Agencies Serving Immigrants
1	YMCA
1	Recreation Centre Advisory Councils
1	Grant Review Board recipient agencies (selected at a meeting for this purpose)
2	Council
1	Department of Parks & Recreation
1	Department of Planning & Development
1	Department of Management Services
1	Toronto Board of Education
1	Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board
14	

2. BY MARCH 1985, THE TASK FORCE SHALL PREPARE A REPORT TO INCLUDE:

   A. STATUS REPORT ON ALL RECOMMENDATIONS OF THIS TASK FORCE ON NEIGHBOURHOOD SOCIAL AND RECREATIONAL SERVICES.

B. THE NEED FOR AND STRUCTURE OF AN ON-GOING ADVISORY BODY.

3. THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE BE GIVEN THE SUPPORT OF TWO CONTRACT STAFF PERSONS:

(a) CO-ORDINATOR
(b) AGENCY RESOURCE OFFICER

THAT THE CO-ORDINATOR BE HIRED AS SOON AS POSSIBLE; THAT FUNDS IN THE AMOUNT OF $8,250 BE PROVIDED FOR THIS PURPOSE; THAT $20,625 BE PROVIDED IN 1983 FOR THE HIRING OF THE AGENCY RESOURCE OFFICER AS OF APRIL 1, 1983, AND $24,750 FOR THE FULL YEAR IMPACT OF THE CO-ORDINATOR'S POSITION; $2,125 FOR SUPPORT COSTS OF THE IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE ARE REQUIRED IN 1982 AND THE FULL YEAR IMPACT IN 1983 WIL BE $6,375.

4. THE JOB DESCRIPTIONS AS CONTAINED IN APPENDIX "G" BE ADOPTED IN PRINCIPLE.

XI. COST IMPLICATIONS

The recommendations of the Task Force that would require additional expenditures by the City are as follows:

1. Revise the current Directory of City Services so as to provide more extensive information on available social and recreational facilities and programs and have the directory delivered annually to each City household.

2. Increase the City grants budget for 1983 so as to more closely match grants with demonstrated financial need.

3. (a) Adjust funding in 1983 for core administrative staffing levels in five Community Centres consistent with the proposed funding guidelines developed by the Task Force. Two Centres have not been included because of the uncertainty of their future requirements (Ralph Thornton and Cowan Avenue Fire Hall).

   (b) To provide for three volunteer co-ordinators on a half-time basis in the Community Centres having total contributed volunteer hours in excess of 5,000 per year, beginning in mid-1983. It is anticipated that this staffing level will be sufficient until total volunteer hours reach 15,000 per year.

4. Provide funds to the Department of Parks and Recreation to include a reception capability in at least one of its Recreation Centres. This is intended to be a two-year pilot project designed to increase utilization of the facility, improve access to program information of the Centre and general information on City-wide services. The pilot project is proposed to commence in July 1983 with an evaluation to be completed by the Department in the summer of 1985.

5. Provide funds for the hiring of two people on a three-year contract basis to undertake the tasks as noted in the final report.

Total additional expenditures arising from the recommendations amount to $206,872.00. However, numbers 4 and 5 are time-limited, thereby resulting in only $114,872.00 being permanently added to the City's expenditures. As noted in Table I, it is also being recommended that these new expenditures be phased in between October 1982 and July 1983.

In reviewing Table I, the following qualifications should be noted that:

- All amounts are shown in 1982 dollars.

- The level for City grants shown for 1984 is not a specific recommendation of the Task Force. It should be assumed that the Grant Review Board will make a recommendation for a level deemed appropriate given the 1983 allocation process.

- Core administrative funding requirements for Ralph Thornton, Cowan Avenue Fire Hall and any other Centre(s) approved by Council would be reviewed against the guidelines proposed by the Task Force.

- The adjustment component of number 3(a) may well have occurred during the program change phase of the 1983 budget process without the existence of the Task Force.

TABLE I

COST IMPACT OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (1982 - 1985)

ITEM	1982 APPROVED BUDGET	1983 PROPOSED	1984 PROPOSED	1985 PROPOSED	CHANGE IN COSTS 1982 - 83	1983 - 84	1984 - 85
1. Directory of Services (includes amounts in current Parks and Recreation and City Clerk's Department Budgets)	$ 60,096	$ 75,096	$ 75,096	$ 75,096	$ 15,000	$ -	$ -
2. City Grants							
a) Recreation Grants	456,488	694,197	694,197*	694,197*	35,000	-	-
b) General Grants	202,709						
Sub-Total:	$ 659,197	$ 694,197					
3. Community Centres							
a) Augment core administrative staff	853,246	853,246					
i) Full-time reception at 55 Main	-	15,974					
ii) Full-time programme co-ordinator at Cecil St.	-	19,648					
	$ 853,246	$ 888,868	$ 888,868	$ 888,868	$ 35,622	-	-
b) Volunteer Co-ordinator (3 part-time staff)	-	14,625	29,250	29,250	14,625	14,625	-
Sub-Total:		$ 903,493	$ 918,118	$ 918,118	$ 50,247		
4. Pilot Project - Reception at a Recreation Centre	8,846,114	8,846,114	8,846,114	8,869,114	11,500	11,500	(11,500)
a) Recreation Division Budget Pilot Project - Receptionist		11,500	23,000	(11,500)			
Sub-Total:		$8,857,614	$8,869,114	$8,857,614			
5. Implementation Task Force							
a) Co-ordinator (contract)	8,250(NB)	33,000	33,000	16,500	24,750	-	(16,500)

TABLE I

COST IMPACT OF TASK FORCE RECOMMENDATIONS (1982 - 1985)

ITEM	1982 APPROVED BUDGET	1983 PROPOSED	1984 PROPOSED	1985 PROPOSED	CHANGE IN COSTS 1982 - 83	1983 - 84	1984 - 85
b) Agency Development and Liaison Officer (contract)	$ (NB)	$ 20,625	$ 27,500	$ 13,750	$ 20,625	$ 6,875	($ 13,750)
c) Support Costs	2,125(NB)	8,500	8,500	4,250	6,375	-	(4,250)
	$ 10,375(NB)	$ 62,125	$ 69,000	$ 34,500	$ 51,750	$ 6,875	$ (34,500)
TOTALS	$10,418,653 + 10,375 (NB) $10,429,028	$10,592,525	$10,625,525	$10,579,525	$ 163,497	$ 33,000	($ 46,000)

* 1983 proposed figure repeated since the Task Force recommendation does not extend to 1984 or beyond.

N.B. - not budgeted

APPENDIX "A"

MANDATE OF THE TASK FORCE

1. That a Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services be established to make recommendations to the Neighbourhoods Committee regarding:

   a. a policy with respect to the City's commitment to social and recreational service provisions and,

   b. changes to the current budget processes for the provision of financial support for social and recreational services.

2. That the Task Force consist of representatives from the following groups:

   A.O.C.C. (2)
   T.A.N.S. (2)
   Recreation Advisory Councils (1)
   City Council (4)
   Toronto Board of Education (1)
   Metropolitan Toronto Separate School Board (1)
   Department of Parks and Recreation (1)

3. That the Task Force be instructed to submit recommendations by September 30, 1981, on the following issues:

   a. current, capital and operating commitments,

   b. appropriate policies and criteria for the assessment of requests for financial support, and

   c. appropriate procedures for assessing requests for financial support.

4. That within 1 year of the establishment of the Task Force it submit a further report on the following issues:

   a. the appropriate extent of direct City involvement in the delivery of social and recreational services,

   b. appropriate areas of providing support to organizations for which the City recognizes some responsibility,

   c. where resources can be provided in lieu of financial support,

   d. a review of the relationship between the nature of programs and the type of facility to determine where better integration might improve use,

   e. to define the appropriate internal relations and procedures within the Civic structure,

   f. to define the appropriate relationship between the internal process and organization providing social and recreational services,

   g. to define what organizational changes and/or additional personnel are required,

   h. identification of service overlaps,

   i. an analysis of volunteer time,

   j. review of existing funding structure for facilities and programs, including City and non-City services.

5. That the Task Force be requested to report back on its proposed process for implementing those tasks set out in Recommendation 4 at its earliest convenience.

6. That Council authorize the provision of funds to the Task Force for the hiring of a full time staff person.

7. That the Task Force be provided with the appropriate departmental resources required for the carrying out of its mandate.

APPENDIX "B"

POLICY ON PRIORITIES FOR USE OF CITY-OPERATED RECREATION CENTRES

It is understood that the prime focus of the facility is to provide a range of basic recreation services. The centre advisory council is responsible for allocating space within the priorities as set out below with the understanding that priorities 2 and 3 require City Council authority.

Priorities for the Use of Recreation Centre and Shared Use School Community Centre Facilities

Priority 1

- Activities organized and conducted by the Department of Parks and Recreation.
- Recreation programs sponsored by community groups or individuals.
- Community service programs, local in nature, and deemed to be of interest to or for the betterment of the neighbourhood.
- Local non-profit recreation activities conducted under the auspices of outside sponsorship.
- Recreation or non-profit recreation activities conducted under the auspices of outside sponsorship City-wide in scope.
- Meetings or discussions of interest to or for the betterment of the community.

Priority 2

After the foregoing priorities have been met and a community or social service agency requires space, consideration should be given to providing space for such service provided such service does not entail additional labour costs in which case the outside agency should assume such and any extraordinary costs.

Priority 3

- Any organization charging admission for the personal gain of the group.
- Any non-resident, non-recreational group, which does not provide a service to the citizens of Toronto.
- Commercial or political individuals, groups or organizations using facilities for any purpose.
- Individuals, for the purpose of holding events considered to be of a personal nature.

After priorities 1 and 2 have been met, facilities would be available on a rental basis.

APPENDIX "C"

POLICY GUIDELINES: RECREATION GRANTS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF PARKS AND RECREATION

INTRODUCTION

Prior to August 1982, all requests for grant funds made by voluntary agencies and community groups offering recreation programs to city residents were reviewed by the City's Grant Review Board. As of _____, _____, City Council approved the creation of a second category of recreation grants with the funds being administered by the Department of Parks and Recreation.

The purpose of this second category is to separate requests and funding arrangements between

1. Comparatively large organizations that:
   - provide a multitude of services and programs, usually on a neighbourhood basis.
   - apply to the City for a grant to provide recreation programs as part of their overall array of services.
   - provide these recreation programs on a year-round and year-to-year basis and have been doing so for many years.
   - requests in excess of $10,000 per year.
2. Comparatively smaller agencies or community groups that:
   - may be requesting only one-time funding.
   - are organized to provide only the program for which they are seeking grant funds, i.e., they are not multi-purpose organizations with diversified programs and funding sources.
   - may often have no full-time or paid staff.
   - propose to provide a program or service of a seasonal nature.
   - propose to serve a specialized population.
   - request less than $10,000 per year.

   Both types of organizations provide needed programs and they contribute to the diversity of services available to City residents.

   The two-tiered system is intended to appropriately match policies, funding criteria and procedures to these distinct types of organizations.

The major characteristics of the system of Departmental Recreation Grants are as follows:

1. A structured link between the Department of Parks and Recreation and the recipient organizations to ensure co-ordination of planning and service delivery.
2. An increased flexibility for the Department to utilize existing agencies as a means of offering recreation services to City residents, and a recognition of the major role these agencies play in the provision of recreation programs in the neighbourhoods they serve.
3. An increased degree of year-to-year stability for programs recognized to be of an on-going nature, and provision of an earlier indication of the City's intent and level of support for the forthcoming year.
4. A program evaluation component to ensure the continuing relevance of funded services to a particular community.
5. The elimination of the requirement to provide background information on the organization that does not change from year-to-year.

PROCEDURES

The funding approach is similar to the Shared Use programs and the summer swimming program provided by the Toronto Board of Education. The grants are individually negotiated by the late summer of every year and incorporated into the budgetary process of the Department. Each agreement is separately identified and follows the general process noted below:

#1

Each agency meets with the Department and negotiates a requisite "inflationary increase" or "program change" to be incorporated in the following year's request. A joint agency/department report is prepared for the Neighbourhoods Committee similar to the way in which the summer swim program or Shared Use accounts are reported upon. The recommendations to the Neighbourhoods Committee include:

a) An amount in the Department's detailed budget for the following year to sustain the level of program currently in operation.

b) A request for authority to include an amount in the Department's program change requests for new programs with an appropriate rationale.

c) A request for resolution of any unresolved differences if all matters have not been jointly agreed upon.

#2

If the request is on a basis similar to the previous year, the item does not appear in the program change requests but appears in the Department's detailed budget. The Department, in requesting its own interim appropriations, requests interim appropriations for this account to carry the operation through until the Department's budget is approved by Council, generally sometime in April or May.

#3

In the event that there is a program change involved, the program change phase is generally approved by Council in early December. At that time, assuming that the request is approved, the Department requests interim appropriations for the grant amount to carry it through until the final budget approval in April or May.

#4

With respect to program evaluation, the Implementation Task Force, in consultation with grant receiving agencies and the Department, will develop some methodologies around program evaluation and these should be initiated in the early part of 1983.

#5

With respect to accountability, departmentally, a staff person will be assigned to liaise with each grant receiving agency, make visitations and carry out joint evaluation of program goals and objectives. Such evaluation will be in part based on the following principles:

a) That the organization is responsive to the community in which it is located.

b) That the organization is competently managed.

c) That the funds are utilized for the recreation programs identified jointly with the Department of Parks and Recreation.

d) That the programs are operated in an efficient manner where the costs can be related to the level of service and the cost of similar programs elsewhere in the City.

#6

Once the need for a program has been identified and agreement reached that an agency will provide such program, the agency has considerable latitude in determining the activities which take place within some general program areas. Where there is a major shift in program, the

agency has a responsibility to advise the City in order that a rationale might be developed to either restructure the program or adjust the level of funding.

For the 1982-83 transition year, organizations receiving recreation grants in excess of $10,000 from the Grant Review Board and having the other characteristics as previously noted will be transferred to the Department's operating budget. Inasmuch as these grants are awarded from June 1st to May 31st of the following year, the Department could build the known grant receiving agencies into its 1983 Budget and provide monies from June 1st, 1983 to December 31st, 1983.

APPENDIX "D"

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES FOR CITY OF TORONTO RECREATIONAL AND GENERAL GRANTS

Introduction

The City of Toronto, under the City of Toronto Act, 1935, Section 4(1), has authority to make grants to institutions and persons carrying on or engaged in work which in the opinion of Council is for the advantage of the inhabitants of the City but where no authority to grant aid is conferred by other statutes. The grants fall outside any cost-sharing formula with other levels of government and are, therefore, financed entirely from City tax revenues. For this reason, eligibility for funding from another level of government will be a consideration in determining the appropriateness of City funding.

Grant Categories

The City provides grant funding under two categories: Recreation Grants and General Grants.

In providing grants to local agencies and organizations offering recreation programs to neighbourhood residents, the City is seeking to support a partnership between the public and voluntary sectors so as to:

- encourage greater responsiveness to the diversity of recreation needs of City residents.
- promote the full utilization of existing facilities and programs.
- maximize the total resources, both public and private, that can be mobilized in the provision of programs.
- support the provision of service by the organizations most suited to the unique needs of particular groups or neighbourhoods.
- promote volunteerism and community initiative.
- promote greater flexibility in the style of program delivery.
- promote integration of a variety of human services where this is deemed desirable.

The provision of recreation grants to the voluntary sector is an integral part of the City's overall approach to ensuring that all citizens have maximum opportunity for the enjoyable, satisfying and creative use of leisure time and to ensuring that such opportunity is provided in the most effective way possible.

In providing General grants to local organizations, the City recognizes the need for a variety of specialized programs or services that are essential to the quality of city life and for which voluntary resources are insufficient or financial support is not within the jurisdiction of other funding bodies. As in the case of recreation grants, the City's support is contingent upon the demonstration of community need for the service and a voluntary component of the program.

Types of Support

Through its grants program, the City of Toronto can provide two types of support which are:

a) Program Support

This type of support is intended for identifiable components, programs or projects of multi-purpose organizations and comparatively small or single purpose organizations whose entire organizational focus is upon the offering of a program. For multi-purpose organizations, the grant application should reflect the total costs less related revenues associated with the component, program or project for which grant assistance is being requested.

(b) Organizational Support

This type of support is to assist in the maintenance of the organization as a whole. The grant is provided to cover basic operational costs, e.g., staff costs, rent, etc., rather than for a specific component or program of the organization. As a general rule, the level of support provided by this type of grant will be limited to a relatively small proportion of the organization's total projected revenues. The organization's efforts to achieve greater reliance upon its major sources of revenue will be a consideration in subsequent requests for "organizational support".

In specifying the type of support being requested, the general rules of thumb are:

1. Multi-purpose organizations should, where feasible, identify a specific component or program for which they are seeking "program support".

2. Groups or organizations that are solely organized to provide a single program, e.g., summer day camp, year-round youth centre, should apply for "program support".

3. Where organizations are requesting financial support for their general purposes and activities, "organizational support" is the appropriate type of support to be indicated in the application.

Eligibility Criteria

All organizations applying for grant support from the City must meet the following criteria:

1. The organization must be of a non-profit nature.

2. The program(s) and activities for which funds are being requested must be primarily intended for the benefit of City residents. Where services will be provided to a broader clientele, the proportion of clientele who are likely to be City residents must be identified.

3. The organization must indicate the basis upon which the need for the program was determined, e.g., surveys, discussions with other service providers, etc.

4. The organization as a whole or the program for which grant funds are being requested must contain a volunteer component.

5. The objectives of the program(s) must be clearly stated. The stated objectives will be reviewed with regard to the likelihood of their achievement in light of the organization's anticipated resources.

6. While it is recognized that programs are frequently designed to serve particular groups of people such as children, handicapped persons, etc., the organization and its programs must be open to participation by all City residents having those needs for which the program is intended to address.

General Policies and Guidelines

In addition to adhering to the eligibility criteria as previously stated, applicant organizations should be guided by the following in seeking grant support:

1. Priority will be given to organizations whose objectives and programs are designed to assist persons who are disadvantaged in terms of income, employment, physical, emotional or developmental handicaps and other such barriers to participation.

2. Applications for general grants will be reviewed in light of eligibility for funding from other levels of government. For example, the Department of Community Services of Metropolitan Toronto provides four types of grants to community agencies. As a general rule, it is not the policy of the City to fund programs for which eligibility exists elsewhere.

3. Where service is also provided to residents of other Boroughs, application should also be made to the appropriate Borough. The amount requested from the City should be generally in proportion to the number of City residents to be served.

4. Where an organization receives a grant in one year and applies in the following year, the amount to be allocated is unlikely to exceed the inflationary adjustment made for Civic services unless some major change or expansion is proposed. The amount requested, therefore, should be guided by this general rule of thumb.

—

The attached copy of the _____ General and Recreational Grants recommendations as approved by Council provide a picture of the amounts of money allocated by the City and the types of organizations supported.

—

Procedures

Applications for both Recreational and General grants are reviewed and allocations recommended to Council by the Grant Review Board. This Board is composed of three representatives of Council. As in the case of Civic Departments, the Grant Review Board develops recommendations for allocations from a total budget that has been approved by Council as part of the City's overall budget process.

Applicants for General and Recreation grants must submit five completed copies of the City of Toronto Grant Application Form no later than March 31st, ____. Grants will be awarded for the period from June 1st, ____ to May 31st, ____.

Applications should be submitted to the City Clerk, Second Floor, City Hall, Toronto, Ontario, M5H 2N2. If additional information or assistance is required, please contact Mrs. Edna Bampton, Secretary to the City of Toronto Grant Review Board, at 367-7715.

Grant applications are processed as follows:

1. Upon receipt the application is forwarded to the Planning and Budgeting Division of the Management Services Department to ensure that the information requested has been provided in sufficient detail. If not, the application will be returned to the applicant for resubmission.

2. The application will then be forwarded to the Grant Review Board. The Board will notify the applicant of the preliminary decision on or about April 30th and provide an opportunity for the applicant to appeal the decision.

3. Final recommendations of the Grant Review Board will then be made to the Neighbourhoods Committee, who in turn will make recommendations to City Council. No grant may be made to any organization without the approval of City Council. Applicants may appeal the final decision of the Grant Review Board to the Neighbourhoods Committee.

—

APPLICATION FOR A GENERAL OR RECREATIONAL GRANT FROM THE CITY OF TORONTO

Each organization applying for a grant must complete this form and forward FIVE copies to the City Clerk, 2nd Floor, City Hall, Toronto, M5H 2N2, on or before March 31st, ____, together with the supporting information indicated. In the event that more space is required in replying to any question, please use a supplementary sheet and attach it to the application. If additional information such as letters of support or explanatory material are submitted, attach one copy to each copy of the completed form.

A. GENERAL

1. Organization

Name:_____

Name of Contact Person:_____

Address:_____

Postal Code_____ Telephone:_____

2. Is the Organization incorporated as a non-profit or charitable Organization?

Yes_____ No_____

3. What are the General Objectives and Activities of the Organization?

4. Define the geographical area in which the Organization operates and the number of persons served. Is the Organization local or is it part of a Metropolitan, Provincial or national Organization?

5. Are the Organization's premises occupied as an owner or tenant? (Give address).

6. Volunteers (Organization as a whole):

a) Are formal records maintained on

i) Number of active volunteers Yes__No__
ii) Number of volunteer hours contributed Yes__No__

b) Estimate or indicate the actual number of active volunteers for the past year. _____

7. Provide a one-page history of the Organization.

8. List the Executive Officers of the Organization.

Name and Title Home Address Telephone (Home & Bus.)

B. SPECIFIC ACTIVITIES

1. Amount of City of Toronto grant requested. $_____

2. Are you applying for a grant for program support or for organizational support? If the former, please indicate the specific program(s) concerned.

3. How many persons will directly enjoy or benefit from the activities for which the grant is requested?

4. Estimate the number of volunteers and numbers of volunteer hours you anticipate will be devoted to the programs for which funding is being requested:

a) Number of volunteers _____
b) Number of volunteer hours _____

5. Does the Organization provide a service for which a charge is made?

6. What other agencies in or close to the catchment area will be offering similar services to the same age or interest groups?

C. GENERAL FINANCING

1. Submit your last Audited Statement, preferably for a year-end in ____.

2. If you received a City of Toronto grant in ____, provide a brief report (no more than two typed pages) on how the grant was used. (Refer to the program objectives stated in your application of last year).

3. Complete the Financial Statement (page 10).

All statements must be submitted by March 31st, ____. If this is not possible, please indicate the reason.

Please be advised that two responsible officers must sign this form. If two responsible officers' signatures are not given, this application will not be considered.

We certify that the Board of Directors is aware of and endorses this request for funding.

NAME AND TITLE _____ ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____
(During Office Hours)

NAME AND TITLE _____ ADDRESS _____

TELEPHONE NUMBER _____
(During Office Hours)

DATE _____

FINANCIAL STATEMENT

(Show all amounts to the nearest dollar)

EXPENDITURES

Salaries and Wages
(Show number) - Full-time Staff
- Part-time Staff

Benefits

Accommodation (Rent or Mortgage & Taxes)

Insurance

Telephone

Utilities

Office Supplies

Office Equipment

Travel & Transportation

Advertising and Promotion

Program Supplies

Other non-capital items (specify by item if any item is more than 5%)

Capital Expenditures (specific)

TOTAL EXPENDITURES

REVENUES

User Fees

Membership Fees

Fund-raising Events

Investment/Interest Income

Receipts from Governments* -
(do not include City grant request)
- Federal
- Provincial
- Metro

Other (specify if more than 5%)

Surplus (deficit) from Last Year

TOTAL REVENUES

Surplus (Deficit) for the year without City of Toronto Grant requested

City of Toronto Grant Request

Surplus (Deficit) for the year after receipt of requested City of Toronto Grant

*Indicate whether these figures are estimates or are assured.

APPENDIX "E"

COMMUNITY CENTRE POLICY GUIDELINES

I. Purposes and Scope of Guidelines

The aim of these guidelines is to define the respective roles, responsibilities and operating policies that will govern the relationship between the City and the community centres operated by Council-appointed boards of management. These guidelines apply to those facilities established by Council by-law under the provisions of the Municipal Act (Ontario) and as listed in Appendix 1.

The three specific purposes of these guidelines are to define:

1. The general roles and responsibilities of the boards of management of community centres.

2. The expectations of Council with respect to the operation of a community centre and the ways in which the boards of management are to be accountable to both Council and the communities they serve.

3. The policies, conditions, criteria and procedures within which Council will provide financial contributions to the operation of community centres.

These guidelines are a supplement to the provisions of the individual Council by-laws under which each of the community centres is established and operates.

II. Roles and Responsibilities of Community Centres

It is the policy of Council that community centres are intended to be multi-purpose facilities providing a broad range of community, recreational and social service programs. They are further intended to provide opportunities for neighbourhood residents to fully participate in the operation of the centre and the delivery of services and programs.

These centres are established by Council and are to be operated on its behalf by local boards of management. The boards are responsible for policy-making, management and on-going operation and maintenance of the centres and their respective programs and services. The boards are accountable to both Council and the communities they serve. The nature of this dual accountability is as follows:

To Council - The board is responsible for the:

1. Management, operation and maintenance of the centre according to the provisions of the by-law under which the centre was established.

2. Governance of the operation of the centre according to generally recognized democratic principles and the provision of clear opportunities for neighbourhood residents to fully participate in the decision-making processes.

3. Annual reporting of the objectives of the centre and the major activities undertaken.

4. Annual reporting of the financial affairs of the centre according to generally accepted accounting principles and the specific policies and procedures established by Council.

To Community Served - The board is responsible to the residents of the neighbourhood in which the centre is located for the:

1. Establishment of provisions for the full and equal participation of neighbourhood residents in the governing structure of the centre and its programs and services.

2. Provision of information on the services, programs, policies, and financial affairs of the centre.

3. Identification of local needs and service priorities.

4. Provision of resources to assist in the development of activities and programs relevant to local needs.

5. Development of volunteer and funding resources to support activities, programs and services.

III. Policy Guidelines

A. Constitutional Requirements

To ensure that neighbourhood residents have clearly recognized opportunities to fully participate in the operation and decision-making processes of a centre and to encourage the development of services and programs reflective of the needs of the area in which a centre is located, every community centre shall have a written constitution. The constitution of the centre must be kept on file in the centre and a copy provided to Council or residents of Toronto upon request. It is further the policy of Council that the constitution of a community centre must contain the following provisions:

1. Stated objectives of the centre consistent with the stated purposes of a community centre as set out in this document.

2. A specified set of geographic boundaries within the City limits that will serve to:

   a) Establish the neighbourhood/community within which needs identification and program development efforts will be primarily focused.

   b) Establish the geographic area within which eligibility to vote at the Annual Meeting of the centre will be determined.

3. The right to vote at the Annual Meeting of the centre shall be extended to all persons over the age of 18 resident within the neighbourhood as set out by the centre and who pay any nominal membership fee as may be required. In the absence of a specific policy on membership, all residents of the area over the age of 18 will be deemed voting members of the centre and eligible to vote at the Annual Meeting.

4. The holding of an Annual Meeting of the voting membership at which the Board will present the program and financial affairs of the centre.

5. Notice of the time and date of the Annual Meeting shall be given at least 30 days in advance and in such a manner as to ensure that eligible voters have reasonable opportunity to receive such notice. Written copies of the Annual Report of the Board shall be available at the address of the centre at the date notice is given of the Annual Meeting.

6. At least sixty (60) per cent of persons constituting the board of management must be elected by the voting membership at an Annual Meeting and no less than one-third (1/3) of such elected positions shall become vacant at any given Annual Meeting of the centre's voting membership.

7. Eligibility to stand for election to the board of management shall include all persons eligible to vote at the Annual Meeting except where deemed ineligible by a Council policy, by-law or other legislative enactment.

8. Except for the appointment of the aldermanic representatives of the ward in which the centre is located, all other appointed positions must be expressly provided for in the constitution of the centre.

9. Elections of board members at the Annual Meeting must be conducted by secret ballot.

10. Where the constitution provides for nominations to close prior to the date of the Annual Meeting, the closing date cannot be more than 10 days prior to the date of the meeting and this provision must be explicitly noted in the notice of the Annual Meeting.

11. Provision for amendment to the constitution requiring a vote between a simple majority up to no more than three-quarters of the voting members present at an Annual Meeting of centre and for which intent to propose a constitutional amendment was included in the notice of the meeting.

12. Provision for the number of successive terms that a person can be a member of the Board (no particular limitation is required although the policy must be explicitly contained in the centre's constitution).

Supportive Policies of Council

Council shall support these governance provisions in the following ways:

1. Annual appointment of the names of persons chosen by the eligible members of centre to constitute the board of management in conformity with the constitutional provisions of the centre, generally recognized democratic procedures, and compliance with Council policy and existing by-laws (as amended) and other related legislative enactments.

2. Encouragement of centres to establish two or three year terms for members of the Board with one-half or one-third of the terms ending each year.

3. Giving positive consideration to requests to amend establishing by-laws to alter the size of the Board.

B. Reporting of Objectives and Activities

1. Each community centre shall annually prepare a report identifying the major activities and programs of the centre and the principal objectives these are designed to achieve. This report should contain:

   a) the objectives, activities and the degree of achievement in the previous fiscal year,

   b) the projected objectives and major activities proposed for the coming fiscal year.

2. Each community centre shall maintain the following information:

   a) the number of active volunteers and number of volunteer hours contributed for the preceding fiscal year,

   b) the number of groups that regularly use the centre's facilities and the type of programs they provide,

   c) a listing and brief description of self-sustaining activities, services or programs of the centre.

3. It is suggested that the information in Nos. 1 and 2 above would be useful components of the Board's Annual Report to its membership. It would therefore be available to users and Council.

Funding Guidelines

The guidelines that follow are intended to provide a common basis upon which budgetary discussions between centres and City can proceed. It is the function of the annual budget approval process to establish specific levels of funding. Centres will be expected to operate within the budgets as approved by Council and to use the program change phase of the City's budget development process to gain approval for changes that would have an impact on the level of City financial support.

The general guidelines that apply to the City's funding of community centres are as follows:

1. That "core administrative" costs of community centres will be eligible for direct City funding and centres will follow the same procedures as followed by a City department in the annual determination of such amounts.

2. "Core administrative" costs shall mean all salary and benefit costs and facility operation and maintenance costs except those directly associated with specific programs and shall include:

   - Salary and benefits of centre personnel involved in:

     - Administration
     - Program and volunteer co-ordination
     - Secretarial and reception
     - Maintenance.

- Materials and supplies related to centre administration and maintenance, e.g., advertising, postage, etc.

- Furniture and equipment of general use to the centre.

- Purchased services such as utility costs, printing and duplication, auditing and minor building repairs.

3. That the City recognizes the need for a centre to have sufficient core administrative staff to:

   a) Effectively manage the day-to-day operation of the centre and assist the board of management with its responsibilities.

   b) Fully utilize the physical capacity of the centre through the development of self-sustaining programs/services and promotion of the use of the centre by local residents.

   c) Efficiently provide reception coverage to the public during the centre's hours of operation.

   d) Ensure the proper maintenance of facility.

4. Increases in the number of staff required to carry out the core administrative components of a centre's operation are considered to be a function of the following:

   a) Physical capacity and condition of the centre

   b) Hours of operation

   c) Level of program activity

   d) Diversity of programs

   e) Absolute size of a centre's total operating budget and the diversity of its sources of revenue.

These factors will be the primary criteria against which the validity of requests for additional staff will be measured.

5. In addition to the documentation provided by the centre, requests for core administrative staff will be considered in light of:

   a) Facility Maintenance

      A review with respect to the staffing levels required to maintain the facility at a standard equivalent to similar facilities owned and operated by the City.

   b) Bookkeeping and Financial Management

      A review with respect to the staffing levels or alternative arrangements required to ensure the adequacy of financial records, the maintenance of proper financial controls and the adequate and timely provision of financial information to the Board and the City.

   c) Volunteer Co-ordination

      i) Until the documented number of active volunteers exceeds 50 or the number of volunteer hours contributed exceeds 5,000, it will be assumed that volunteer co-ordination is a component of the program co-ordinator's responsibilities.

      ii) Need for a half-time volunteer co-ordinator will be demonstrated when the following circumstances exist:

a) Documented number of active volunteers exceeds 50 and the annual number of volunteer hours contributed exceeds 5,000.

b) Documentation has been supplied with respect to the amount of time spent by existing staff in performance of the volunteer co-ordination function.

iii) Need for a full-time volunteer co-ordinator will be demonstrated when the following circumstances exist:

a) Documented number of active volunteers exceeds 100 and the annual number of volunteer hours contributed exceeds 15,000.

b) Documentation has been supplied with respect to the amount of time spent by existing staff in performance of the volunteer co-ordination function.

iv) Where requests for paid personnel are made, the centre should:

a) be registered and have a signed memorandum of understanding with the Volunteer Centre of Metropolitan Toronto;

b) have a job description in general conformity with that contained in Appendix 2;

c) Seek consultative assistance from the Volunteer Centre with respect to the design of a volunteer co-ordination program that will ensure effective use of volunteers.

6. Revenue generated by the centre shall be retained by the centre and available for use in the provision of programs. Annual surpluses of such funds shall be retained by the centre and any deficit shall be the responsibility of the centre.

7. Year-end surpluses related to the core administrative funds of the centre shall be recoverable by the City.

8. Community centres shall be deemed eligible to apply for City grants available to other local non-profit organizations.

9. Community centres shall restrict their budget requests for core administrative funds to the budgetary mechanisms designed for this purpose and will not be eligible for such funding from other City sources such as the Grant Review Board.

10. Community centres established after January 1, 1983 shall be eligible for program seed money for a three-year period following the official opening of the centre. The maximum amount for which a centre is eligible in the first year of operation is $5,000 and this amount will automatically be reduced by 1/3 each year thereafter. This provision of program seed money recognizes that revenues for self-sustaining programs cannot be immediately generated by a new centre. The reduction formula, however, indicates the expectation that centres will increase these revenues over the first three years.

APPENDIX E.1.

1. Cecil Street Community Centre
2. 519 Church Street Community Centre
3. Community Centre 55
4. Cowan Avenue Firehall Community Centre
5. Scadding Court Community Centre
6. Third Floor Eglinton Community Centre
7. Ralph Thornton Community Centre

APPENDIX E.2.

THE VOLUNTEER CO-ORDINATOR

This position requires a person who is flexible, creative and sensitive, with an ability to motivate volunteers and develop a positive utilization of their skills.

RESPONSIBILITIES

- develop and supervise the organization's service programs in conjunction with the service volunteers and with the people in the community with whom the service volunteers work
- recruit, train, orient, supervise and evaluate the service volunteers
- maintain good rapport between the service volunteers and the people in the community
- communicate the progress of the service volunteer program to the Executive Director and/or the Board of Directors
- assume responsibility for a continuous service volunteer education program
- prepare clearly written job descriptions for the service volunteers
- provide liaison between the service volunteers and the Board of Directors or the Executive Director
- be responsible to the Executive Director (or the Board if there is not an Executive Director)
- sit on the Board, if appointed, as representative of service volunteers and report as such. Is usually a non-voting member
- have the ability to determine where and how volunteers can help in the solution of community problems
- keep current information on community needs for volunteers, sources of volunteers and community resources
- maintain adequate volunteer records
- maintain Board business and client confidentiality.

APPENDIX "F"

PROCEDURES FOR FUTURE DEVELOPMENT OF CITY FUNDED RECREATION AND COMMUNITY CENTRES

A. Introduction

Over the past few years, the City has supported the development of both City-operated recreation centres and City-funded community centres. These two types of facilities can be distinguished by the degree of emphasis placed on the provision of community service versus recreation programs and their management structures. The City currently lacks a policy and written procedures as to how a service development process that arrives at a choice between these two types of centres should proceed. Consequently, the process itself and the final selection decision has displayed some of the following:

- Insufficient representation of relevant parties.
- Lack of clear expectations with respect to local planning structures and group composition.
- Inadequate needs and resources studies.
- Lack of written criteria to be used in determining proposals eligible for Council consideration.
- Exploration of an inadequate variety of alternatives for potentially meeting local needs.
- Lack of clear opportunities for normal response by City departments and community agencies to identified needs and proposed service/centre development alternatives.
- Lack of opportunities for Council to give approval in principle at critical stages of the process.
- Lack of criteria to be used in selecting program/ service emphasis of final proposal and appropriate management structure.

B. Purpose of Guidelines

These guidelines have been developed to ensure that emerging community groups will be aware from the outset of the criteria that Council will use in deciding on the merits of City support for specific proposals arising from neighbourhood needs, identification and service development efforts.

These guidelines place emphasis upon the documentation of local needs and the thorough consideration of various alternatives to meeting identified needs, the promotion of the use of existing agencies, facilities and resources rather than the development of new facilities and clear opportunities for Council decision at critical planning stages. The guidelines assume that a variety of organizational forms could be developed at the neighbourhood level to achieve the requirements of these guidelines.

Generally speaking, local service planning efforts can be seen as proceeding through three stages:

- Formation of a group of people and organizations around perceived problems or issues.
- Identification and assessment of local needs and available resources.
- Development of a detailed proposal for addressing the identified issues and problems.

These guidelines are organized around these three stages.

STAGE I - Initiation

The initiation of some neighbourhood process that ultimately leads to a new facility or the expansion or modification of an existing community or recreation agency can take many forms. It can result from groups of neighbourhood residents coming together to deal with a specific perceived need or issue or it could be generated by another process, e.g. Neighbourhood Improvement Program. A group of agencies providing service might also initiate such a process to facilitate a more comprehensive system of services in the neighbourhoods they serve.

These guidelines do not prescribe a particular form that the initiation of neighbourhood needs identification and service development initiatives should take. They do, however, identify the criteria that Council will use in considering the merits of requests for City support for specific proposals that may emerge from such local initiatives.

It is recognized that these guidelines tend to be oriented to existing communities. Where there is no existing community, e.g., St. Lawrence, the planning process would need to include special provisions such as the involvement of agencies providing services in surrounding areas.

PHASE II - Identification of Needs and Resources

Guidelines

1. No proposal for a City supported recreation or community centre will be considered prior to the completion of a study of local needs and resources.

2. Greater consideration will be given to studies involving the participation of the following:

    - local residents
    - community and recreation agencies currently providing service in the local area.
    - representation of the Department of Planning and Development.
    - representation of the Department of Parks and Recreation.

3. The local needs and resources study should take into consideration existing statements of city-wide needs and priorities.

4. A report on needs and resources shall be submitted to Council for its consideration and comment.

5. Following the completion of the needs and resources study, a report on Service Options must be prepared for Council consideration. This Options Report must provide evidence that at least the following 4 options were adequately considered:

    1. Needs not sufficient for further action.

2. Existing organizations can co-ordinate activities to meet the identified needs without further City action other than monitoring of progress.
3. Needs can be met by existing organizations but additional City resources are required. This option must be accompanied by an approximated ballpark cost of City resources required for the first 3 years.
4. City initiative is required to develop a new facility. Again this option must be accompanied by an approximated ballpark cost to the City for the first 3 years.

If either Option 3. or 4. is being recommended, the following steps must be undertaken.

a) Requests for written responses on the Needs, Resources and Options Report shall be made to appropriate civic departments and community agencies and these responses shall be included in the report submitted to Council. A request for such response within one month shall be deemed adequate.

b) The report with written responses attached shall be submitted to Council for its review and request for approval in principle.

PHASE III - Development of Detailed Proposal (if 3. or 4.)

Guidelines:

If Option 3. is approved in principle by Council, a detailed proposal must be developed and it must contain the following:

1. Report on community consultation process followed.
2. The types of services needed and the priorities for service development.
3. The existing organizations to be involved and the roles that each should play.
4. Documentation that the identified organizations are willing to perform these roles proposed and the necessary conditions for such participation given Council approval of the proposal.
5. The nature and extent of non-City resources that will be utilized and the likelihood that these will be forthcoming.
6. A review of various management/organizational structures that could be utilized and a recommended model.
7. Estimated costs to the City of the proposal and proposed methods of accountability.

Proposal submitted to Council for decision.

If Option 4. is approved in principle by Council, a detailed proposal must be developed and it must contain the following:

1. Report on community consultation process followed.
2. The types of services needed and their priorities.
3. The reasons why a new agency and/or facility is required.
4. A review of various management/organizational models considered, a recommended model, the criteria used in making the recommendation and a description of how the model would fit into existing funding structures of the City.
5. The ways in which the proposed organization would co-ordinate its programs with existing organizations.
6. The nature and extent of non-City resources that will be utilized and the likelihood that these will be forthcoming.
7. Proposed methods of accountability to Council and users.

8. Estimated costs to the City of the proposal (both capital and operating*).

Proposal submitted to Council for decision.

*Where Option 4 is approved, the determination of the initial staffing levels, whether the facility is to be a directly-operated recreation centre or a City-funded community centre, will follow the principle that sufficient staff are required to efficiently and effectively realize the physical and program potential of the facility.

During the period August 1, 1982 - June 30, 1985, the Implementation Task Force will review proposals under these guidelines on the request of Neighbourhoods Committee.

APPENDIX "G"

MANDATE OF IMPLEMENTATION TASK FORCE AND JOB DESCRIPTIONS OF CONTRACT STAFF

MANDATE:

The Implementation Task Force is established for the period August 1, 1982 - June 30, 1985 for the following purposes:

1. To monitor and provide progress reports to Neighbourhoods Committee on the recommendations made by the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services and adopted by Council and to propose and/or facilitate appropriate remedial action where implementation difficulties arise.

2. To provide an inter-agency forum for the co-ordination of community and recreational services and the resolution of problems at an administrative level.

3. To monitor, report and make recommendations to Neighbourhoods Committee on the priorities for the distribution of City recreational and community service resources at the request of the Neighbourhoods Committee.

4. To act as a monitoring and review body for all proposals to establish new facilities where City financial support is being requested or is likely to be requested at the request of Neighbourhoods Committee.

5. To provide consultative assistance to all City-operated or funded programs with respect to implementation of the changes arising from the final report of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services.

6. To organize the use of non-financial resources and expertise available within civic departments and community agencies and to provide such support directly where this is appropriate. This service is to be available to all City-operated or funded programs and the priorities shall include:

   - Program planning and use of demographic information
   - Board development
   - Organizational objective setting processes
   - Methods of serving special population groups such as ethnic minorities
   - Fund raising
   - Volunteer recruitment and training
   - Public relations

7. To provide assistance to the City Grant Review Board with respect to:

   a) delineation of funding responsibilities between the City and other funding bodies such as Metro;

b) appropriate transfers between the two-tiered system of recreation grants to voluntary agencies;

c) annual estimates for the overall level of grant support.

8. To develop program evaluation methodologies for use in City operated and funded programs.

JOB DESCRIPTIONS OF CONTRACT STAFF:

A. Task Force Co-ordinator (contract position)

Under the general direction of the Task Force and the direct supervision of the Chairman of the Task Force, the Co-ordinator shall:

1. Co-ordinate all executive and administrative functions of the Task Force such as:

   a) Co-ordinate the preparation of agendas, minutes, correspondence and reports.

   b) Arrange meetings of the Task Force and its subcommittees.

   c) Organize and structure the work of the Task Force.

   d) Supervise the Agency Resource Officer.

2. Develop and maintain on-going liaison with civic staff and representatives of community agencies.

3. Establish a system for monitoring the progress of City-operated and funded agencies with respect to the implementation of Council-approved recommendations of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services.

4. Provide the primary staff research function with respect to the delineation of the appropriate funding responsibilities between the City and other funding bodies and prepare reports and recommendations for Task Force consideration.

5. Assist in the identification and presentation of issues related to neighbourhood co-ordination of services.

6. Review and report to the Task Force on proposals for the development of new facilities where such reports have been requested of the Task Force by the Neighbourhoods Committee.

7. Identify and propose areas where joint planning and/or co-ordinated program delivery are appropriate.

8. Research and develop recommendations for appropriate management models for new facility operation.

9. Research and develop recommendations for streamlining the relationships between civic departments and external organizations.

B. AGENCY RESOURCE OFFICER (contract position)

Under the general direction of the Task Force and the direct supervision of the Co-ordinator, the Agency Resource Officer shall:

1. Provide consultative assistance to existing community centres with particular regard to:

   a) Development of constitutions in conformity with City policy.

   b) Development of common program data collection and reporting formats.

c) Institution of objective setting and program evaluation methodologies and processes.

2. In co-operation with the Management Services Department, undertake those activities necessary to assist in the streamlining of interrelations between this department and funded agencies with respect to budget preparation and management.

3. Make available to all City-funded agencies, either directly or through the co-ordinated use of existing resources, technical expertise and non-financial resources to enhance the functioning of such agencies.

4. Specifically organize a program of agency development assistance with respect to the areas of:

   - Fund raising
   - Board development
   - Organizational objective setting and evaluation
   - Methods of serving special population groups such as ethnic communities
   - Volunteer recruitment, training and management
   - Public relations
   - Program planning and evaluation.

5. Maintain liaison with City-funded agencies.

6. Assist the Co-ordinator in the research and report preparation activities requested by the Task Force.

7. Undertake specific studies of areas where there is a perceived need to improve the co-ordination of services.

8. Assist specific agencies to identify potential sources of grant funds for which they appear eligible.

APPENDIX "H"

BACKGROUND PAPER - Available on request from the Task Force

The Neighbourhoods Committee submitted the communication (June 2, 1982) from the City Solicitor, addressed to the Chairman, Task Force on Neighbourhood, Social and Recreational Services to City Council:

Re: Request for Review and Comment on the draft report of the Task Force on Neighbourhood, Social and Recreational Services

I acknowledge your letter of May 14, 1982, requesting my comments on your draft report.

Recommendation 1 of your draft report on page 19 reads as follows:

> "That City-funded community centres adopt a set of constitutional provisions and procedures for the selection and operation of boards of management consistent with the guidelines set out by the task force by January 1, 1983."

1. A community centre of course cannot adopt anything, nor can it have a constitution since as itself it is not a legal entity. Consequently, I do not know what is meant by this recommendation but if it refers to the board or committee of management set up to operate and manage the Centre, then it is clear that the rules under which such board or committee of management must operate must be within the legislative authority under which such board or committee of management was set up, and in my view as such, these rules should be set out in the by-law setting up the board or committee of management. If however you are referring to the constitution of some separate entity as opposed to a board or committee of

management, I am most concerned. Over the past number of years, I have at various times been consulted when there were serious difficulties in certain community and recreation centres and invariably such difficulties arise from certain non-profit corporations which have for some reason been set up bearing the name of the community or recreation centre. I have never been able to ascertain why such corporations have been set up or what function they serve, however, I do know that members of the public and members of the board of management or committee of management and members of Council become quite confused as to who is in effect running the community or recreation centre, where such corporations exist.

It seems to me that your report is deficient in not addressing this problem, and if in fact the above-mentioned recommendation is endorsing these corporations, some further clarification as to the function and role thereof is required if your report is to correct what I know to be a serious problem. Furthermore, I point out that it is up to Council to appoint members of the boards or committees of management and I query what "constitutional provisions and procedures for the selection and operation of Boards of Management" really means.

Respecting the appendix document headed "Community Centre Policy Guidelines" I have the following comments:

1. Insofar as the "constitutional requirements" set out in the Guidelines I ask to what body shall such constitutional requirement apply? Where Council entrusts to a board or committee of management the power to manage and operate a centre, I fail to see how Council can then impose "constitutional" requirements upon such Board or committee, although certain provisions could be included in the by-law establishing such board or committee of management, subject of course to the constraints in the legislation enabling Council to establish it. I fail to see how a community centre can have a written constitution or hold an annual meeting. This area of the guidelines it seems to me needs to be thoroughly recast and until then I really cannot be of much assistance other than to point out that the guidelines are incomprehensible in this respect.

2. Paragraph numbered 6 on page 3 would appear to be inconsistent with Section 208 paragraph 57(i) of the Municipal Act which reads as follows:

   "(i) Members of a board of management appointed under this paragraph shall hold office at the pleasure of the council that appointed them and unless sooner removed shall hold office until the expiration of the term of the council that appointed them and until their successors are appointed and are eligible for reappointment."

3. Respecting paragraph numbered 7 on page 3 I point out that council may only appoint persons to the board who are qualified to be elected as members of the Council.

In the first paragraph of the appendix entitled "City Grant Review Board: Issues and Recommendations", you mention the City's authority to make certain grants under Section 4(1) of the City of Toronto Act, 1935. I point out to you section 113(1) of the Municipal Act which reads as follows:

"Notwithstanding any special provision in this Act or in any other general or special Act related to the making of grants or granting of aid by the council of a municipality, the council of every municipality may, subject to section 112, make grants, on such terms and conditions as to security and otherwise as the council may consider expedient, to any person, institution, association, group or body of any kind, including a fund, within or outside the boundaries of the municipality for any purpose that, in the opinion of the council, is in the interests of the municipality".

The Neighbourhoods Committee also submitted the communication (June 11, 1982) from G. Kathleen Bee, Vice-Chairman, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association:

We have received notice that the Committee will hear our deputation in this matter on June 15, 1982, at 12:00 noon (Item F).

This report is quite lengthy and discusses many important issues. For these reasons, we request deferral of this item so that we will have more time to consider the report, consult with each other and respond to it.

The Neighbourhoods Committee also submitted the report (June 10, 1982) from the City Clerk:

Subject: Final Report, Task Force on Neighbourhood, Social and Recreational Services.

Comments: Having reviewed the Final Report and noting the report dated June 2, 1982, from the City Solicitor in relation thereto I advise that the Solicitor has stated the concerns I had.

In addition, if it should be recommended that annual meetings take place for community centres, I am bound to advise that my Department would not be in a position to be involved with any elections such centres may decide to have.

The Neighbourhoods Committee also submitted the communication (June 14, 1982) from Janet Pugsley of The 519 Church Street Community Centre:

When one of the Aldermen saw the Funding Subcommittee's report on the cost impact of the Task Force's recommendations, his response was "Where is all the radical stuff?"

The result of the Task Force's work was not to produce "radical stuff". Rather, it was to take serious account of the "partnership" between City government and the neighbourhoods where social, community and recreational services are performed.

In a way that perhaps none of us anticipated, the Task Force not only laboriously worked out a definition and structure for that partnership, but in its very way of going about its business it has itself served as a model for a positive and fruitful relationship between the relevant parties. This - in the long run, and notwithstanding its substantial achievements in policy and procedural development - may turn out to be its most valuable contribution.

Early in the process there emerged, by unspoken consent of all concerned, a First Principle, which, I suggest, was more responsible than any other single factor for the smooth, cohesive, and "productive" work of the Task Force. That principle is that all parties - Council, Commissioners, Civic staff, Boards of Management, Community Centre staff and volunteers, voluntary community agencies, etc. - share a single common objective: "the best quality of appropriate services to residents of City neighbourhoods through the most efficient use of the taxpayer's dollar."

This principle, along with a "positive" approach taken by all parties whereby the existing structures were realistically evaluated and their strengths recognized and built upon, has seen much of the mistrust and acrimony between City Hall and community, virtually melt away.

We of A.O.C.C. are proud to have played a major role in the instigation of the Task Force and the processes about which I have just spoken. We believe strongly that what has worked once will work again. We therefore ask Council to take note of the role we have played and to recognize particularly that we are not only capable but also desirous of rising above our own specific problems and interests to recognize both the interests of the broader network of community services as well as the specific concerns of Council for economy and accountability.

We further would urge Council to act on all of the Task Force's recommendations in a way that will give structure and recognition particularly to that system of community services that has emerged in partnership with City government in the past decade; that will make all City-supported services more accessible and more responsive to local initiative; and that will ensure the continued partnership between City Hall and community representatives built upon mutual trust and shared decision-making.

The Neighbourhoods Committee also submitted the communication (June 15, 1982) from A. Owen, Y.M.C.A. of Metropolitan Toronto:

Final Report of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood, Social and Recreational Services.

The YMCA made a presentation to the Task Force at a special meeting organized for that purpose and has been pleased to have representation at subsequent public hearings. We've appreciated the opportunity of presenting our views.

We wish to support the tenor and the essential recommendations of the task force report in our brief statement.

The acknowledgement of the contribution of the private and voluntary sector in providing programs is refreshing and appreciated by the many volunteers and part-time staff involved in our YMCA's located in Toronto.

We depend upon the availability of facilities at a neighbourhood level in order to involve the public in a variety of educational/recreation/activities which we are capable of providing. Such facilities are becoming increasingly difficult to secure as public supported institutions have broadened their mandate and increased competition with heavily subsidized offerings. We believe that the provision of such programs ought not to be the monopoly of any public or private organizations and support the concept of diversity of deliverers of service.

We continue to question the general availability of services free of charge given limited financial resources generally to meet community needs in the 1980's. We believe this approach encourages what we feel to be a prevailing and growing attitude that governments ought to do everything, solve everything and fund everything. We believe public funds ought to be directed toward the areas of greatest economic need and generally encourage others to pay for what they receive in the way of services.

We appreciate, however, that the City's policy has been in effect since 1960 when affluence was a "catchword" and all things were possible because resources would be "never ending". This has set expectations which would be difficult to alter and we would never underestimate the political cost which could be involved.

We support the concept that the City ought to assure that a broad range of recreational services are available to the public. We note that this does not mean that the City ought to deliver all of them directly. We support the suggestions that the City contract with private, voluntary organizations to deliver services thus draining upon that broad pool of talent. We also support the premise that such private voluntary organizations ought to be accountable for delivering the programs/services which they have declared themselves ready to deliver with City funding.

We also, however, believe that non-profit organizations which charge fees for their programs to cover all of their costs also play a vital role in the recreational service system in the City. We ought not to be discriminated against with regard to that function which we serve or with regard to availability of facilities to deliver those programs. Independence, self-reliance, self-responsibility, 'paying ones way' are also important values to help sustain a vibrant citizenry and strong communities capable of doing many things for themselves with their own resources.

We believe that any implementation of the policy proposed by the Task Force will require the involvement of the Board of Education since the Board controls an external network of neighbourhood facilities upon which the private and voluntary sector is dependent in order to provide services.

The rationalization of services and procedures proposed in the Task Force report should go a long way toward assuring efficiency, accountability and a vibrant neighbourhood base of recreational programs and community services.

The proposed implementation task force will assist in assuming appropriate monitoring and it's composition will insure input from both the public and the private voluntary sector along the way. YMCA looks forward to participating in such a task force.

Thank you for the opportunity of making our support and concerns known to your Neighbourhoods Committee.

The following appeared before the Neighbourhoods Committee:

- ***Paul Zarnke, Chairman, Community Task Force on Neighbourhoods, Social and Recreational Services;***
- ***Judith Levkoe, Y.M.C.A. of Metropolitan Toronto;***

- *Janet Pugsley, Association of Community Centres;*
- *Charlotte Maher, Toronto Association of Neighbourhood Services;*
- *G. Kathleen Bee, Vice-Chairman, St. Lawrence Neighbourhood Association; and*
- *Alderman Reville.*

The Neighbourhoods Committee recommended the following to City Council:

1. **that the Final Report of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhoods, Social and Recreational Services be adopted;**
2. **that with respect to recommendation 3 under "Implementation Monitoring and Development", the Executive Committee be requested to provide funds in the amount of $10,375; for the hiring of the Co-ordinator in 1982 - $8,250, and for support costs of the Implementation Task Force in 1982 - $2,125;**
3. **that the Co-ordinator be requested to provide a progress report to the first meeting of the Neighbourhoods Committee in December, 1982, and that the abovementioned recommendation 3 be reviewed at that time.**

During consideration of this Clause, Council also had before it a report (June 30, 1982) from Alderman Rowlands, Chairman of the Budget Review Group:

Origin: Alderman June Rowlands (c10cncl82032:89)

Comments: At its meeting held on June 11, 1982, the Budget Review Group had before it the Final Report of the Community Task Force on Neighbourhood Social and Recreational Services.

The Budget Review Group decided to recommend the following:

Recommendations:

1. *That all future years' budgetary impacts of the recommendations of the Task Force be subject to the Operating Budget cycle.*
2. *That recommendation 10 under "City Funding Policy" be amended by striking out the word "provided" in the first line of the recommendation and replacing it with the word "requested."*
3. *That the Implementation Task Force be requested to develop and report on an evaluation methodology with respect to the implementation of the recommendations of the Community Task Force report by April 1, 1983.*
4. *That the position of "Agency Resource Officer" referred to in recommendation 3 under "Implementation, Monitoring and Development" be approved at this point only in principle and that the Implementation Task Force be requested to submit a Programme Change request for this position as part of the 1983 Operating Budget cycle.*
5. *That the $10,375 required for the balance of 1982 with respect to recommendation 2 of the Neighbourhoods Committee be provided from the Contingency Account.*

Council amended the foregoing Clause by adding at the end thereof the following:

"It is further recommended that the report (June 30, 1982) from the Chairman of the Budget Review Group be adopted, and that the recommendations of the Neighbourhoods Committee be amended accordingly."